43520

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

LINDA BERNICE PETERAT

Date of Birth — Date de naissance	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance
Oct 21/1946	CANADA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

Box 1493
SPRUCE GROVE, ALTA T0E 2C0

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

Job Satisfaction of Home Economics Teachers

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Master of Education

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse
1979	Dr. V. Lefebure

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date	Signature
Sept 24/79	Linda B. Peterat

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

JOB SATISFACTION OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

by

© Linda Peterat

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1979

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled JOB SATISFACTION OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS submitted by LINDA PETERAT in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Verna Lefebvre
Supervisor

Ann L. Harvey

Anne Gonzalequen

DATE: Sept 13/79

ABSTRACT

Teachers of home economics have experienced numerous changes during their career. In a profession dominated by women, changes in womens' role in society, education and the profession have had an effect. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and selected demographic variables of home economics teachers.

A Survey Form was developed consisting of three sections: a job satisfaction questionnaire, a self-rating section, and a demographic section. The job satisfaction section and demographic data section were developed for this study. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was used in the self-rating section to measure self-esteem. The Survey Form was pretested with a group of home economics teachers and revised. A reliability coefficient of .77 resulted for both the job satisfaction and self-rating sections in a test retest reliability study, completed with 18 home economics teachers over an interval of two weeks. The Survey Form was mailed to a random sample of 235 home economics teachers in Alberta. Data obtained from 190 (80.85%) respondents were used in the analysis.

Most teachers (81.48%) indicated high overall job satisfaction in teaching home economics. The main sources of satisfaction for home economics teachers concerned freedom to select teaching methods and subject matter, relationships with students, administrators and other teachers, size of classes and salary. The main sources of dissatisfaction concerned inservice education opportunities, pre-service education, the understanding which parents and other teachers have of home economics

and substitute teacher services.

An analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship between the demographic variables concerning experience, years and location of university training, age, parental status, size of population center in which school is located, professional activity and association membership, level and home economics subject area in teaching assignment, and the likelihood of teaching home economics next year and overall job satisfaction. A significant difference was found in job satisfaction ($p = .01$) between the groups likely and unlikely to be teaching home economics next year.

High self-esteem was found for most respondents (93.16%). A significant correlation ($p = .002$) resulted between overall job satisfaction and self-esteem.

The findings provide insight to the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for home economics teachers and to the relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction. On the basis of the findings, it was recommended that representatives of the Alberta Department of Education, Faculty of Education, Home Economics Specialist Council and supervisors of home economics discuss and cooperatively plan actions to alleviate the main sources of dissatisfaction in an effort to keep home economics teachers highly interested, growing and motivated in their work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am most appreciative of the time and patience extended to me by Dr. Verna Lefebvre. Her constant encouragement, guidance and excellent assistance throughout this study was most appreciated. Thanks also to Dr. Ann Harvey and Dr. Anne Kernaleguen for their interest, advice and helpful suggestions.

The time and cooperation of home economics teachers who participated in the pre-test and test-retest studies and who responded to the Survey Form is very much appreciated. I also wish to acknowledge the assistance given by Craig Montgomery and Doug Girvan with the statistical analysis and by Donna Nicol with her excellent and efficient typing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
The Research Question	2
Definition of Terms	2
Limitations	4
Assumptions	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
Self-Esteem	5
Rosenberg	6
Coopersmith	7
Ziller	7
Levels of Self-Esteem	7
Job Satisfaction	8
Job Satisfaction and Teachers	11
Job Satisfaction Studies in Home Economics	15
Job Satisfaction, Self-Esteem, and Teachers	16
Research in Home Economics Education	18
Summary	20
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	21
The Sample	21
Design and Procedures	21
Description of Instruments	23

CHAPTER PAGE

Job Satisfaction Questionnaire ---------- 23

Self-Esteem Scale ---------- 24

The Demographic Questionnaire ---------- 25

Statistical Analysis of Data ---------- 26

IV. RESULTS ---------- 30

Introduction ---------- 30

Description of Respondents ---------- 30

Research Questions and Results ---------- 41

Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction ---------- 41

Changes Which Will Improve Satisfaction ---------- 51

Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction ---------- 54

Self-Esteem and Job Satisfaction ---------- 62

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS ---------- 65

Summary ---------- 65

Discussion ---------- 66

Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction ---------- 66

Relationship Between Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction ---------- 69

Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Job Satisfaction ---------- 75

Conclusions ---------- 76

Implications and Recommendations ---------- 77

School Administrators ---------- 78

The Alberta Department of Education ---------- 79

Faculty of Education ---------- 79

The Home Economics Specialist Council ---------- 80

CHAPTER PAGE

Teachers of Home Economics ---------- 80

Additional Recommendations ---------- 80

Suggestions for Further Research ---------- 81

***

BIBLIOGRAPHY ---------- 83

APPENDIX A. TABLES ---------- 89

APPENDIX B. SURVEY FORM ---------- 117

APPENDIX C. CORRESPONDENCE ---------- 122

VITA ---------- 126

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	The Survey Sample	22
2	Respondents Classified by Years of Teaching Experience	31
3	Respondents Classifed by Years of Academic Training	33
4	Respondents Classified by Subject Area Major at University	33
5	Respondents Classified by Where Most University Education Was Obtained	34
6	Respondents Classified by Size of Population Center in Which School Located	34
7	Respondents Classified by Age	35
8	Respondents Classified by Number of Children	36
9	Respondents Participating in Professional Activities During the Past Two Years	38
10	Respondents Classified by Number of Memberships in Professional Associations	39
11	Respondents Classified by Level of Teaching Assignment	40
12	Respondents Classified by Home Economics Subject Areas Taught	42
13	Respondents Likelihood of Teaching Home Economics Next Year	43
14	Plans for Those Unlikely to be Teaching Home Economics Next Year	44
15	Percentages of Respondents, Means and Standard Deviations on Items Showing Most Satisfaction	45
16	Percentages of Responses, Means and Standard Deviations on Items Showing Most Dissatisfaction	47

Table	Description	Page
17	Number of Respondents, Percentages in Contracted Categories and Means for Each Job Satisfaction Item	48
18	Changes Which Will Improve Satisfaction with Teaching	52
19	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Likelihood of Teaching Home Economics Next Year	61
20	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Likelihood of Teaching Home Economics Next Year	61
21	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Classified by Scores Obtained on Self-Rating Scale	63
22	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Classified by Age	90
23	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Classified by Activity Scores	91
24	Percentage Frequency Distribution of Responses to Job Satisfaction Items, Percentages in Contracted Categories, Number of Respondents and the Mean Response to Each Item	92
25	Correlation Coefficients and Probabilities of Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction Variables	95
26	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Different Categories of Experience in Teaching Home Economics	98
27	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Experience in Teaching Home Economics	98
28	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Satisfied in Categories of Experience in Teaching Home Economics	99
29	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Those Having and Not Having Teaching Experience in Addition to Home Economics	100

Table	Description	Page
30	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents Having Experience Other Than Home Economics and Those Having Only Home Economics Experience	100
31	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Different Categories of Years of Training	101
32	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories of Years of Training	101
33	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Different Categories According to Subject Area Major	102
34	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Subject Area Major	102
35	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentage Satisfied for Categories According to Where University Training Was Obtained	103
36	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Where University Training Was Obtained	103
37	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Size of Population Centre in Which School Located	104
38	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Size of Population Center in Which School is Located	104
39	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Age	105
40	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Age	105
41	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Satisfied in Categories by Age	106
42	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Parental Status	107

Table	Description	Page
43	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Parental Status	107
44	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Number of Professional Association Memberships	108
45	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores in Different Categories According to Number of Professional Association Memberships	108
46	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories of Professional Activity	109
47	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories of Professional Activity	109
48	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Teaching Level	110
49	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Teaching Level	110
50	Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Number of Home Economics Subject Areas in Teaching Assignment	111
51	Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Number of Home Economics Subject Areas in Teaching Assignment	111
52	Years of Home Economics Teaching Experience of Those Unlikely to be Teaching Home Economics Next Year	112
53	Years of Training for Respondents Unlikely to be Teaching Next Year	113
54	Self-Esteem Scores for Respondents Unlikely to be Teaching Next Year	113
55	Correlation Coefficients and Probabilities for Self-Esteem and Job Satisfaction Variables	114

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Philosophy and goal changes in both education and home economics have caused considerable controversy within the professional career span of many who are presently teaching home economics in Alberta. Recently, the publication of the Goals of Basic Education for Alberta (1977) focused discussion on the philosophy and goals of education for Albertans. Some home economics teachers expressed concern that the future emphasis in education would be on the 'goals of schooling' and that this would limit the future goals and role of home economics in the schools. This uncertainty comes at a time when more women teachers, including home economics teachers, are considering a career in education on a long term basis. A study by the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation (1976) found that almost equal numbers of men and women teachers stated that it was very important to them to continue in their profession. The same study found that 51.3% of the women studied, aspired to positions within their profession other than classroom teaching. Are these changes, uncertainties, and heightened aspirations reflected in the job satisfaction presently felt by home economics teachers?

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and selected demographic variables of home economics teachers. An exploration of this relationship should be useful to an understanding of the individual in the work situation. If there is a relationship between job satisfaction and self-esteem, exploring

this relationship could be meaningful to the understanding of teacher behaviour.

The Research Question

Among home economics teachers in Alberta:

1. What are the sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in their present work situation?

2. Is there a relationship between selected demographic variables and overall job satisfaction?

3. Is there a relationship between self-esteem, selected items of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, terms are defined as follows:

Home Economics Teacher: This term refers to a teacher who spends fifty percent or more of instructional time teaching home economics in the public or separate schools of Alberta. Persons defined as home economics teachers were determined through the teachers' reporting of teaching time in the demographic data section of the Survey Form (See Appendix B).

Job Satisfaction: This term refers to a person's attitudes toward factors of their present work situation. These attitudes encompass the values and aspirations which one brings to the job and the evaluative judgement one makes as to the extent which these are satisfactorily met in the work situation. Job satisfaction is operationally defined as the subjects' response to each of the 42 closed-end items in the satisfaction

section of the Survey Form. There are five possible responses, ranging on a scale from very dissatisfied to very satisfied, for each item. Overall job satisfaction is indicated by the response to one item (item 42) in the questionnaire.

Self Concept: Self-concept refers to one's attitudes, feelings and perceptions of oneself. It is a more inclusive attitude to the self than is self-esteem, which is viewed as an evaluative component of the self-concept.

Self-Esteem: Self-esteem refers to a positive or negative attitude toward the self (Rosenberg, 1965, p. 30). Self-esteem is composed of both an assessing and an evaluating dimension. Self-esteem is operationally defined as the score obtained on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. Possible scores range from 0 (high) to 6 (low). High self-esteem indicates that an individual feels oneself to be a person of worth and that one respects oneself for what one is. One does not stand in awe of oneself nor consider oneself superior to others. Low self-esteem implies self-rejection, self-dissatisfaction, and lack of self-respect (Rosenberg, 1965, p. 31).

Survey Form: The Survey Form refers to the questionnaire mailed to each teacher in the sample. The form consisted of a job satisfaction section, designed for this study and used to indicate levels of job satisfaction; a self rating section which used the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale to indicate self attitudes; and a demographic data section which provided information about the survey respondents (Appendix B).

Limitations

The results of this study were subject to the following limitations.

1. The study was restricted to a random sample of home economics teachers in Alberta who were teaching home economics, fifty per cent or more of their instructional time during 1978-79.

2. The study reflects the views held at the given time, spring 1979, and as they existed in the particular individual work situations.

Assumptions

1. Each questionnaire received from the subjects of the study was completed in good faith, by the individual to whom it was addressed.

2. The responses to the completed questionnaire were an accurate reflection of the subjects' attitudes to her work situation, to herself, and of her demographic characteristics.

3. The instruments used to assess job satisfaction and self-esteem were valid and reliable measures of these variables.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The job, for many people, forms the major part of their social context. The job provides feedback on one's worth and competence and thereby may contribute to one's self-esteem (Gergen, 1977, p. 46). The literature in this review has been selected to provide a basic understanding of the two major variables under consideration in this study: job satisfaction and self-esteem. The first section deals with self-esteem. Literature and research on job satisfaction is reviewed in the second section. The final section includes a review of the research in home economics education in Alberta which is relevant to this study.

Self-Esteem

Self-esteem, as defined for this study, refers to a positive or negative attitude toward one's self. As such, the concept of self-esteem is a component of the more inclusive construct of self concept. The understanding of self-esteem must therefore begin with an understanding of the self theory on which it is based. The writings of Mead (1934) form the basis for the concept of self-esteem in this study. Mead proposed that the self was a social phenomenon, the product of interactions in which the person experienced one's self as reflected in the behavior of others. In this view, the individual, through experience and use of language, develops the ability to take on the roles of many selves according to the perceived expectations that others have of one's self. In addition Mead developed the idea of a "generalized other" which allows for a more generalized sense of self. The self can be thought of

as a collection of reflexive attitudes which form in the context of a given social situation. If the self is described as a set of reflexive attitudes, self-esteem can be considered as the evaluative component of each of these attitudes or as the total of such evaluations.

Mead's (1934) approach to self has formed the basis for theories of self-esteem developed by Coopersmith (1967) and Rosenberg (1965). Coopersmith, Rosenberg, and Ziller (1969) have made the most explicit attempts to develop theories of self-esteem.

Rosenberg

Rosenberg (1965) concentrated on the study of self-esteem and its correlates during adolescence. Rosenberg studied self-esteem as one of the many attitudes that individuals form toward objects and analyzed it according to the dimenions of: content, direction, intensity, importance, salience, consistency, stability, and clarity (1965, p. 6). However, he recognized five qualitative differences in self-attitude studies: different attitudes to different objects are studied, the importance of the self to everyone, the motivation to hold positive self attitudes, the self as both subject and object of the study, and the reflexive nature of the self.

According to Rosenberg, all self-attitudes have an estimating as well as evaluating dimension. The estimating dimension involves the individual in rating one's self with regard to a particular characteristic. The evaluating dimension involves one in determining the importance or value of the characteristic. Overall self-esteem represents the psychological summation of specific value-weighted self-estimations.

From his research, Rosenberg (1965) concluded that people with low self-esteem exhibit more personality characteristics indicating

generally neurotic tendencies, report greater difficulty and hesitation in social interaction and tend to have lower aspirations and expectations for success than individuals with high self-esteem.

Coopersmith

Coopersmith (1967) studied mainly pre-high school adolescents to develop his theory of self-esteem. Coopersmith conceptualized self-esteem as being more complex and as involving four determinants: success, values, aspirations and defenses. Self-esteem involves evaluative attitudes about the self and stronger connotations of affection along with evaluation.

Ziller

Ziller (1969) approached self-esteem somewhat differently by using a non-verbal measure of self-esteem. Carlson (1970) critized this research technique for allowing a sex-typed bias and cultural bias to influence results. Ziller's approach has been widely discussed although not widely accepted. Ziller described self-esteem as a mediator or buffer zone between the self and the real world outside the senses. When an individual's social environment changes, self-esteem determines the resulting changes in self evaluation.

Levels of self-esteem

Linked to each theory of self-esteem is an assumption of the optimum level of self-esteem. Although reasons have been made for the desirability of low or medium self-esteem (Wells and Marwell, 1976, p. 234), most commonly, it is high self-esteem that is related to healthy behaviour or good adjustment. The "high self-esteem as desirable"

approach suggests that persons possessing high self-esteem are less anxious and defensive, more secure, successful and socially acceptable than low self-esteem persons. Accordingly, this approach describes the person with low self-esteem as lacking in self-confidence, as being dependent upon others, as shy, unexplorative and guarded. The "high self-esteem as desirable" approach is the one accepted by Rosenberg (1965) and the one which forms the basis for this study.

Job Satisfaction

Many research studies in job satisfaction have attempted to verify or dispute Herzberg's (1959, 1966) theory of motivation-hygiene factors. Herzberg used the interview method to ask workers to describe satisfying or dissatisfying experiences in their work. From the responses, he found that certain factors, which he identified as motivators, stood out as strong determinants of job satisfaction. These motivator factors were recognition, achievement, responsibility, advancement, and the nature of the work itself. Factors causing dissatisfaction, which Herzberg identified as hygiene factors, were supervision, salary, working conditions, interpersonal relations, company policy and administration. Herzberg hypothesized that the motivation and hygiene factors were mutually exclusive. That is, motivation factors (associated with the work itself) lead to job satisfaction when they are present, but not to dissatisfaction when absent. Likewise, the hygiene factors (associated with conditions of work) are dissatisfiers when present, but do not lead to satisfaction when absent. In subsequent studies, the factors identified by Herzberg as causing satisfaction or dissatisfaction have been more widely accepted than the proposed exclusive contribution these

factors make to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Friedlander (1964) examined the model of job satisfaction as a bipolar satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum. Friedlander studied eighty subjects employed full-time in various occupations. He concluded that for most job characteristics, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not complementary functions. That is, a job characteristic which provides satisfaction for many persons may not cause dissatisfaction when it is not present in a job situation. Friendlander's findings tend to support Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory in part. However, Friedlander's (1964) findings indicate that intrinsic (motivation) job characteristics were important to both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and were overall more important than extrinsic (hygiene) factors.

Other studies have concentrated on whether the needs of the individual are met on the job. Schultz (1973) proposed that the dissatisfiers identified by Herzberg are situational or extrinsic factors which compare to the lower order security and social needs of Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory (1954). Schultz likewise proposed that the satisfiers are intrinsic factors which compare to the higher order needs of esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization of Maslow's theory. Therefore, Schultz (1973) concluded that the hygiene factors must be satisfied before the motivators can be.

An additional approach to the study of job satisfaction has been to focus on the relationship between the individual and the organization. This interactionist approach relates to the Getzels-Guba (1957) model of social behaviour and proposes that satisfaction is a function of the congruence of role and personality.

Locke (1969) proposed that the causes of job satisfaction are neither entirely in the job itself nor the individual, but in the relationship between them. Locke (1969, p. 316) describes job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction is determined by a process constituted by three elements: (1) an individual's perception of some aspect of the job, (2) the individual's 'value standard', and (3) a judgement of the relationship between (1) and (2).

Mumford (1972) used an interactionist approach in an extensive study of the job satisfaction of computer programmers. Mumford proposed that job satisfaction results from the fit between organizational demands and individual needs. She analyzed the fit between five dimensions: company job requirements - personal job requirements, company interest - self interest, uniformity - individuality, professional - personal quality, work specialization - work flexibility. Mumford has provided an analytical basis for a sociological - interactionist approach to job satisfaction. However, the dimensions analyzed have yet to be interpreted into a useable survey monitoring instrument.

All studies of job satisfaction underline the complexity of the concept. Locke (1969, p. 315) described job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "complex emotional reactions to the job". Mumford (1972, p. 184) stated that, "if the fit between what people seek from work . . . and this may be a very complex set of wants - and what they actually receive is a good one, then it can be said that they have high job satisfaction".

Job satisfaction is an outcome, an affective reaction of the individual in relationship to the organization. Although attempts have been made to predict job performance or job effectiveness from job satisfaction, findings have been inconclusive. Lawler and Porter (1976, p. 211) stated that satisfaction can be best thought of as depending on performance rather than causing it.

Friedlander (1964) cautioned on the generalizing of research findings on job satisfaction to other work groups or organizations. Indications are that factors of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction are individually and situationally dependent. Job satisfaction can also be expected to alter during an individual's lifetime as one's needs, expectations, and aspirations alter.

Job satisfaction and teachers

Okonkwo (1966) studied the factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction of a stratified sample of 359 teachers in Alberta. He found high overall satisfaction. The main factors of dissatisfaction were channels of communication, principals who criticized teachers indiscriminately, the administrative functions of supervisors and consultants, recognition of outstanding teachers, differences in the ability of pupils and extra supervisory duties.

Francoeur (1963) investigated factors causing satisfaction or dissatisfaction among teachers in Quebec City. She used a teacher's checklist adapted from Chase (1952) to survey a total of 471 teachers. Six factors of dissatisfaction were identified as lack of opportunity to participate in making the curriculum, in making the apportionment of subject matter, in preparing schedules, in making policies for grouping,

the control and promotion of pupils; the unattainability of the aims and objectives formulated in the course of studies, and the limited organization of extra professional activities of a recreational or cultural nature.

Sergiovanni (1967) replicated Herzberg's study with teachers in New York state. He concluded that the factors which contribute predominantly to teacher job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, and responsibility. The factors which contribute predominantly to teacher dissatisfaction are interpersonal relations (peers and students), supervision (technical), school policy and administration, status and personal life.

Mitchell, Warren, and Clarke (1968) conducted a survey of a random sampling of Alberta teachers in 1967. Several items in the questionnaire were replicated from a 1964 study which allowed for a longitudinal study of satisfaction levels. A factor analysis of the satisfaction items indicated three dimensions of satisfaction - career, personal-professional, and work. Those items measuring career satisfaction were found to be opportunities for advancement, the current career position and the methods employed to judge teacher effectiveness. Those items measuring personal-professional satisfaction were the recognition given to teachers by society and by other professionals, opportunity for the development of one's abilities in teaching, and the teachers' own morale. Those items determining work satisfaction were the absence of irritations such as educationally unprepared administrators and colleagues, lack of communciation and cooperation between the teacher and the administrator, inadequate school supplies, and the manner in which student discipline problems are handled. Results of

this longitudinal study (Mitchell et al., 1968) indicated that inexperienced teachers have higher levels of aspiration and more dissatisfaction than experienced teachers. The level of aspirations of teachers had also increased substantially over the three years between surveys.

Karolat (1971) used the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire to determine differences between the factors of job satisfaction for academic and non-academic teachers in comprehensive schools of Saskatchewan. He found that significant differences in job satisfaction depended upon age, sex, and total number of years of teaching experience. Karolat found that job satisfaction tended to increase with increases in age. This finding is also reported by Okonkwo (1966). Karolat found female teachers to be more satisfied with their jobs than males. This finding is supported by Belasco and Alutto (1972), Wickstrom (1973), Lortie (1975), Brinkman (1966), and Holdaway (1978). Finally, Karolat found that teachers with seven or more years of total teaching experience were more satisfied than teachers with less than seven years. This finding was also reported by Clarke (1968).

Wickstrom (1973) studied the sources of job satisfaction of a random sample of teachers in Saskatoon. He found that four top ranking satisfiers in the order of importance were: sense of achievement, work itself, interpersonal relations, and responsibility. The four top ranking dissatisfiers were: lack of achievement, poor school policy and administration, unfavourable work conditions and adverse effects of the job on one's personal life.

Hewitson (1975) studied the satisfaction of beginning teachers in eight school jurisdictions surrounding Edmonton, Alberta. He analyzed questionnaire data provided by 71 principals and 213 beginning teachers. He studied the relationship between beginning teachers' decision-making involvement and supervision, and professional and career satisfaction. He found that high levels of decision-making involvement were significantly associated with professional satisfaction. High levels of decision-making involvement were also associated with high rapport with the principal, which was associated with high levels of career satisfaction.

Holdaway (1978) surveyed a stratified random sample of 801 Alberta teachers. A questionnaire was developed which contained fifty-nine satisfaction items, twelve related variables, free response questions and spaces for opinions. The study found that as grade level taught by respondents increased, there was a decline in overall satisfaction and a decline in satisfaction with a substantial number of work aspects.

The Holdaway (1978) study assessed overall job satisfaction through the response to one item in the questionnaire. This overall satisfaction response was then correlated with each other item. The highest correlations were with sense of achievement in teaching, the prospect of teaching as a lifetime career, recognition of one's work by others, and intellectual stimulation (Holdaway, 1978, p. 89). A factor analysis of the satisfaction variables identified seven clusters: recognition and status, students, resources, teaching assignment, involvement with administrators, workload, salary and benefits. Overall satisfaction occurred in the "recognition and status" cluster.

Questionnaire items which had the highest means and highest percentages satisfied, generally related to work aspects over which the teachers themselves had considerable control. The items identified as contributing most to dissatisfaction involved aspects over which teachers had least control, such as attitudes of society and parents towards education and teachers (Holdaway, 1978).

Job satisfaction studies in home economics

Job satisfaction studies within home economics include studies of home economists in education and administration. The studies reviewed in this section include an American Vocational Association study (1948), a study by Huang (1976), and Spitze and Minish (1977). An additional study by Schultz (1975) is reported in the next section of this chapter.

An American Vocational Association research bulletin (1948) reported on an early nation wide study done in the United States of factors affecting the satisfaction of home economics teachers. The study attempted to determine the factors which influence women to remain in or to leave the teaching profession. A sample of 1,000 teachers responded to forms seeking information on the teachers' work conditions, teaching load, responses to statements of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and general reactions to their job.

This study found satisfaction to be independent of length of teaching experience, type of previous experiences, and type of program taught. The satisfying factors for the majority of teachers were helping with pupil growth, engaging in stimulating intellectual activities, having opportunities for advancement and for long vacations. Satisfaction was also higher with teachers who had the assistance of a

school administrator and a home economics supervisor, and with teachers working in larger population centers. More satisfaction was found with married teachers than single teachers. One-quarter of the total group with family responsibilities reported that these responsibilities made it difficult for them to advance professionally.

Huang (1976) studied professional attitudes, commitment, and selected demographic variables as indicators of home economists' employment satisfaction. A stratified random sample of 320 was used. All were members of the American Home Economics Association and 41% of the respondents were teachers. Findings of this study indicated a low negative correlation between employment satisfaction and number of children; and no correlation between employment satisfaction and marital status or education level. Huang (1976) concluded that employment satisfaction was not positively correlated with professional commitment and that work per se and work related factors were equally powerful as employment satisfaction determinants.

Spitze and Minish (1977) studied the work factors which posed as obstacles to effective teaching. Four hundred home economics teachers in Illinois responded to a questionnaire which asked them to list the obstacles to effective teaching which they perceived. Obstacles which rated highly among those studied were lack of time, lack of ideas or creativity, methods and materials, class schedules, the number of daily preparation periods and class size.

Job satisfaction, self-esteem, and teachers

Sergiovanni (1975) suggested reasons for the present importance of teacher job satisfaction. He described the era of the '70's in education as being a period of entrenchment, of teacher surplus, of

declining student enrollments, and of economic slowdown. Because of these situational factors, Sergiovanni suggested that teachers who are dissatisfied with their jobs are now less likely to leave and are staying within the profession for the wrong reasons. The importance of understanding teacher job satisfaction is that supervisors may have a better understanding of how to keep teachers interested, growing, and highly motivated.

Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) studied the relationship between the individual and the work situation. They concluded that work may be the focus of identity, social status, prestige, worth and competence for the individual (Gurin et al., 1960, p. 143).

Lortie (1970) studied the relationship between the teacher and the work situation and concluded that occupations shape people. He further stated that "teachers tend to underestimate the rank of their occupation; that findings suggest that teachers have . . . a deficit rather than a surplus of self-esteem" (1973, p. 480).

Positive self-esteem is considered necessary for teaching effectiveness by Coombs (1970) and Sergiovanni (1975). Coombs (1970, p. 22) stated that "the behavior of a teacher . . . is a function of his concept of self. Teachers who believe they are able, will try." Sergiovanni (1975, p. 41) suggested that "when a teacher is at work, whatever he or she does is inspired by the underlying attitudes toward self, student, subject and the world at large."

Two recent studies on the relationship between job satisfaction and the self-concept of teachers were done by Wurtz (1972) and Schultz (1975). Wurtz (1972) investigated the effects of self-concept and other independent variables on the prediction of teacher job satisfaction.

The Bullock Job Satisfaction Scale and Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values was administered to a sample of 318 administrators, supervisors, and teachers. Wurtz concluded that teachers who are female, hold an advanced degree, and whose self-ideal, self-discrepancy score is small were the most satisfied in their jobs. He found the following independent variables to be significantly related to job satisfaction: self-ideal, self-discrepancy score, age, job level, degree, and experience. Findings were similar for the administrators, supervisors and teachers studied. The self-ideal, self-discrepancy score was the most powerful variable for predicting job satisfaction.

Schultz (1975) studied the job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept of 238 college faculty members in home economics. Schultz used a three part instrument, developed by Super (1963) to measure self-concept. Each part of the questionnaire contained fifty traits, to which the subjects responded according to whether each trait was perceived as a personal trait, an ideal trait, or a job demanded trait. Congruency scores among responses in the three parts were determined to assess self-concept. Significant correlations were found among job satisfaction factor scores, life satisfaction factor scores, and the self-concept discrepancy scores. It was concluded that home economics college faculty generally were satisfied with their jobs, themselves, and life in general; and that relationships existed among job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and self-concept.

Research in Home Economics Education

Alberta studies completed in home economics education which have implications for this study are those by Bowen (1974), Plican (1975),

and Mann (1977).

Bowen (1974) studied the feelings of teachers in relation to the modern living component of the curriculum which had been introduced in 1972. Bowen studied a random sample of 125 junior high home economics teachers. Eighty-two percent of the respondents believed that home economics should not be confined to foods and clothing. However, eighty-five percent of the sample indicated that modern living concepts were being taught in other disciplines. A high eighty-nine percent wanted more inservice work and indicated that more background preparation was necessary to feel comfortable teaching modern living concepts.

Plican (1975) studied the attitudes of principals, counselors, students, and teachers toward the secondary home economics program. Questionnaires were developed and administered to a sample of students chosen by cluster sampling methods and to all teachers, counselors, and principals of the Edmonton schools in which secondary home economics was taught. Plican found a significant difference in beliefs concerning home economics programs between home economics teachers and students, as well as home economics teachers and counselors. Beliefs that home economics was not as important as other matriculation subjects and that home economics was of little use to males was prevalent. A lack of knowledge about the content and quality of home economics programs was indicated in the study.

Mann (1977) studied the perceptions of teachers of home economics as to how they teach and how they believe they are expected to teach. A mailed questionnaire was used to study the perceptions of a random sampling of teachers. Factors of teacher preparation time, school program scheduling and class loads were cited as significant in

determining the use of teaching techniques.

Those teachers having larger classes used significantly more lab work, televised and video taped programs and resource persons as teaching techniques. Those having more preparation time used significantly more role playing and symposia as teaching techniques.

Summary

The review of literature on job satisfaction illustrates the extent of the possible dimensions of teacher job satisfaction. The literature and research on self-esteem emphasize the influence that an individual's situation has on the formation of one's self-esteem. Although there is indication of a possible relationship between job satisfaction and self-esteem, little research has been done to explore this relationship among teachers, especially home economics teachers, in their work situation.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter includes descriptions of the selection of the sample, the design and procedures, the instruments, and the statistical methods for analyzing the data.

The Sample

A list of the names and addresses of teachers who were teaching home economics one-third or more of their time during the 1978-79 school year was obtained from Alberta Education. The list contained a total of 470 names. Because the only information available on the population was that obtained from Alberta Education and because of the exploratory nature of the study, a simple random sample of the population was judged appropriate (Compton and Hall, 1972, p. 192). The computer was used to select a random sample of 235 names from the total population.

A total of 212 teachers replied to the Survey Form. From the information provided in the demographic data section of the Survey Form, those respondents who indicated home economics teaching time as less than 50% of the total teaching time, were eliminated from the data analysis. As well, 12 returned but incomplete Survey Forms were not used. A total of 190 useable returns was obtained. Table 1 summarizes the sample contacted.

Design and Procedures

A survey study was conducted to explore the relationship between the selected factors of job satisfaction, self-esteem and selected

Table 1

The Survey Sample

	Number	Percentage
Useable responses	190	80.85
Incomplete responses	12	5.11
Teaching home economics less than 50% of time	10	4.25
Moved	2	.85
Did not reply	21	8.94
Total	235	100.00

demographic variables of home economics teachers in Alberta. The study was of a cross-sectional design with home economics teachers as the units of analysis. Self-esteem was treated as the dependent variable; the demographic variables and job satisfaction as independent variables.

A total of 235 home economics teachers in Alberta were contacted by mail. Each subject received a package containing: a letter of introduction, the Survey Form, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Returned Survey Forms were recorded by an identifying number being placed on each form before mailing to subjects. Upon receipt of the returned form, the subject's name was checked off a master list. Two weeks after the original mailing, a follow up package was mailed to those subjects who had not responded. Ten days after the second mailing, a second reminder package was sent to those who had not responded.

Description of Instruments

The Survey Form used to collect the data for this study consisted of three sections: a job satisfaction questionnaire, a self-esteem scale, and a demographic questionnaire.

Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

The job satisfaction questionnaire was developed for this study. A review of the research and literature indicated that there was no existing job satisfaction questionnaire specifically designed for home economics teachers. In an attempt to reach the situationally specific items contributing to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, it was decided to design a questionnaire. The review of the literature and existing job satisfaction questionnaires were used as a basis for

deciding on the dimensions of job satisfaction to include in the questionnaire. The questionnaire included 42 closed-end statements for which five response alternatives were provided: very satisfied, satisifed, neutral, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied. Overall satisfaction was measured by the response to one item on the questionnaire. One open-ended question was included. This question was designed to seek the teachers' opinion on changes that they would like to have occur which would contribute most to their future satisfaction with teaching.

The questionnaire was pre-tested on an interview basis with six home economics teachers. The pre-test subjects were questioned on the ambiguity of the questionnaire item, the ease of completing the items, and the need for additional items or response categories.

To determine the test-retest reliability, the job satisfaction section of the Survey Form was administered to a group of 18 home economics teachers on two occasions, with an interval of two weeks. The reliability coefficient, based on analysis of the five category responses was .62. Response categories were contracted to three by combining satisfied and very satisfied; dissatisfied and very dissatisfied. The reliability coefficient based on three category responses was .77.

The Kuder Richardson formula 20 was calculated as a measure of internal consistency or homogeneity of the items in the job satisfaction section of the Survey Form (Ferguson, 1976). The KR 20 reliability coefficient was .87.

Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was selected to measure teachers' self-esteem in this study. The scale was developed by Rosenberg (1965)

and extensively utilized in his studies of adolescents. The scale is a Guttman type scale consisting of ten attitude statements about one's self, and providing four response alternatives: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. The possible range of scores is from 0 (high self-esteem) to 6 (low self-esteem). Rosenberg reported a reproducibility coefficient of .92 for the scale. Silber and Tippet (1965) found a test-retest correlation over two weeks of .85 in a study of 28 college students.

Yamamoto and Wiersma (1967) used the Rosenberg scale in a study of 96 student teachers. They found the scale to discriminate between levels of self-esteem of the subjects and found significantly higher self-esteem in female rather than male student teachers.

Wylie (1974) in her extensive and thorough review of instruments for measuring self-concept strongly recommended the Rosenberg scale. Her recommendation was based on what she judged to be the impressive validity and reliability of the scale as well as its simplified approach to measuring self-esteem. These factors were considered most important in the decision to use the Rosenberg scale in this study.

A test-retest reliability study was completed on the self-esteem scale at the same time as the job satisfaction questionnaire. Seventeen home economics teachers responded to the self-esteem scale on a two week interval. The reliability coefficient for this group was .77.

The Demographic Questionnaire

This section consisted of 13 closed-end questions pertaining to demographic characteristics of the respondents. The questions were

designed to seek information pertaining to the following characteristics of the respondents: teaching assignment, teaching experience, location and years of training, location of school, professional involvement, age, parental status, and plans for next year.

Statistical Analysis of Data

The responses in this study were analyzed according to the research questions stated in Chapter I. The data resulting from the job satisfaction and self-esteem questionnaires were treated as interval data according to the recommendations of Babbie (1973) and Fox (1969). The data from the complete questionnaires were transferred to punch cards and the statistical tests were conducted in the Department of Educational Research Services at the University of Alberta.

Research Question #1: Among home economics teachers in Alberta what are the sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in their present work situation?

The responses to each item on the job satisfaction questionnaire were scored from 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied). The percentage frequency distribution of responses and the mean score for each satisfaction item was computed. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the scores on the expressed overall satisfaction item and the scores on each job satisfaction item was calculated.

Research Question #2: Among home economics teachers in Alberta, is there a relationship between selected demographic variables and job satisfaction?

The following null hypotheses were used in studying this question:

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers in different experience categories.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers in different subject area experience categories.

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers with different education levels.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers differing in university major.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for different categories of location of university training.

Hypothesis 6:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers in different sizes of population centers.

Hypothesis 7:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores among teachers in different age categories.

Hypothesis 8:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores among groups of differing parental status.

Hypothesis 9:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores among groups having different numbers of professional association memberships.

Hypothesis 10:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores among groups having different levels of professional activity.

Hypothesis 11:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for groups at different levels of teaching assignment.

Hypothesis 12:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for groups having different numbers of home economics content areas in teaching assignment.

Hypothesis 13:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores between groups who are likely or unlikely to be teaching home economics next year.

The percentage of respondents expressing overall job satisfaction for each demographically different group was computed and an analysis of variance was used to test each of these hypothesis.

Research Question #3: Among home economics teachers in Alberta is there a relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction?

The following null hypotheses were used in studying this question:

Hypothesis 14:

There is no significant correlation between overall job satisfaction scores and self-esteem scores.

Hypothesis 15:

There is no significant correlation between items of job satisfaction and self-esteem scores.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated in studying the relationship between each of the job satisfaction items included in the job satisfaction questionnaire and the self-esteem variable. The probability levels for the correlation coefficients were determined to test Hypotheses 14 and 15.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

Survey forms were sent to a random sample of 235 home economics teachers in Alberta. Useable responses were obtained from 190 (80.85%) of those teachers contacted. Respondents completed the three sections of the Survey Form, providing information on job satisfaction, a self-rating scale, and demographic data. This chapter includes a description of respondents provided from the demographic data section and a discussion and analysis of the job satisfaction and self-rating data according to the research questions and hypotheses outlined in Chapter III.

Description of Respondents

The frequency distributions for categories of years of experience in teaching home economics and in total teaching are shown in Table 2. Of all respondents, 46.84% were in their first five years of experience in teaching home economics, 31.58% had 6-10 years of experience and 21.58% had more than ten years of experience. The range of experience in teaching home economics was 1-31 years, the mean number of years was 7.24. Forty-five (23.68%) of the respondents had additional years of teaching experience beyond those in home economics. The range of experience in total years of teaching was 1-35 years, the mean number of years was 8.38.

Respondents reported the number of years of academic training for which they are evaluated for salary purposes, where training was obtained

Table 2

Respondents Classified by Years of Teaching Experience

Years	Home Economics		Total	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1 - 5	89	46.84	81	42.62
6 - 10	60	31.58	57	30.00
11 - 15	25	13.15	28	14.73
16 - 20	10	5.27	12	6.32
21 - 25	4	2.11	6	3.17
26 - 30	-	-	2	1.05
31 - 35	2	1.05	4	2.11
Total	190	100.00	190	100.00

and their subject area major. The number of respondents categorized according to numbers of years of training for salary purposes are reported in Table 3. A total of 127 (66.84%) of the respondents had four years of training. Fifty-nine (31.06%) had five or six years of training and four (2.10%) had less than four years of training.

The subject area major of respondents is reported in Table 4. Home economics was the subject area major at university for 181 (95.77%) of the respondents, while only eight (4.23%) had a subject area major other than home economics.

Where repondents obtained most of their university education is reported in Table 5. Most of the respondents (72.63%) obtained most of their university education in Alberta, while 27.38% received most of their university training elsewhere.

The size of population center in which respondents' schools were located is reported in Table 6. Teachers located in population centers of less than 25,000 composed 86 or 45.26% of the respondents; those in population centers of more than 25,000 made up 54.74% or 104 respondents.

The ages of respondents are categorized and reported in Table 7. The age of respondents ranged from 21 to 59, with the mean age being 32. This mean age is comparable to that of the Task Force on Women of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation (1976) which found the mean age of women teachers to be between 30 and 34. The age category of 25-29 years contained the largest number of teachers (57). The numbers and percentages of respondents of each age is reported in Table 22, Appendix A.

The parental status of respondents is reported in Table 8. One

Table 3

Respondents Classified by Years of Academic Training

Years	Frequency	Percentage
1	-	-
2	2	1.05
3	2	1.05
4	127	66.84
5	49	25.80
6	10	5.26
Total	190	100.00

Table 4

Respondents Classified by Subject Area Major at University

Subject Area Major	Frequency	Percentage
Home economics	181	95.77
Other	8	4.23
Total	189	100.00

Table 5

Respondents Classified by Where Most University Education was Obtained

Where Education Obtained	Frequency	Percentage
Alberta	138	72.63
Other Canadian province	42	22.11
United States	9	4.74
Other country	1	.53
Total	190	100.00

Table 6

Respondents Classified by Size of Population Center in Which School Located

Size	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 10,000	72	37.89
10,000 - 25,000	14	7.37
Over 25,000	104	54.74
Total	190	100.00

Table 7

Respondents Classified by Age

Age Category	Frequency	Percentage
20 - 24	53	17.84
25 - 29	57	30.81
30 - 34	40	21.62
35 - 39	22	11.89
40 - 44	7	3.78
45 - 49	9	4.87
50 - 54	10	5.41
55 - 60	7	3.78
Total	185	100.00

Table 8

Respondents Classified by Number of Children

Number of Children	Frequency	Percentage
0	110	57.89
1	29	15.26
2	28	14.74
3	13	6.84
4	6	3.16
5	3	1.58
6	1	.53
Total	190	100.00

hundred and ten respondents (57.89%) had no children, 47 (30%) had one or two children; while 23 (12.11%) had three or more children.

The extent of professional involvement of respondents was measured by their reporting the number of professional related activities in which they were involved during the past two years and the number of professional association memberships they held. The professional related activities included conferences, workshops or seminars, non-credit courses, university credit courses and programs offering certification. A score of one, two, or three was assigned to a response of one or two, three or four, or five or more, respectively. A total activity score for each individual was calculated and the frequency of responses for each score is reported in Table 23, Appendix A. Seven respondents did not check any activities and not all activities were checked by each respondent.

The activities and total frequencies checked were: workshops or seminars, 171; conferences, 153; non-credit courses, 89; university credit courses, 41; and programs offering certification, 20. Table 9 summarizes the frequencies with which respondents checked the various activity categories.

The reported membership in professional associations of respondents is in Table 10. The number of memberships held ranged from 0-8, with a mean of 1.64.

The respondents' teaching assignment categorized by grade level is reported in Table 11. Five teachers reported elementary grades as part of their teaching assignment. Seventy-three (38.42%) of the respondents taught junior high only, 52 (27.37%) taught senior high only, and 64 (34.21%) taught some other combination of junior and senior high

Table 9

Respondents Participating in Professional Activities
During the Past Two Years

Activity	1 - 2	3 - 4	5 or more	Total
Conferences	120	26	7	153
Workshops or Seminars	85	55	31	171
Non-credit courses	66	13	10	89
University credit courses	29	5	7	41
Programs offering certification	16	1	3	20

Table 10

Respondents Classified by Number of Memberships in Professional Associations

Number of Memberships	Frequency	Percentage
0	22	11.58
1	71	37.37
2	67	35.26
3	20	10.53
4	7	3.68
5	1	.53
6	1	.53
7	-	-
8	1	.53
Total	190	100.00

Table 11

Respondents Classified by Level of Teaching Assignment

Grade Level	Frequency	Percentage
Junior high only	73	38.42
Senior high only	52	27.37
Junior/Senior (50/50)	27	14.21
Junior/Senior (other time combinations)	38	20.00
Total	190	100.00

levels.

The home economics subject areas taught by respondents are summarized in Table 12. The largest group of respondents (86 or 45.26%) taught all three subject areas of home economics.

Respondents reported on the likelihood of continuing to work as a home economics teacher next year. Table 13 summarizes the frequencies and percentages of responses to the five choices provided in the demographic questionnaire. A total of 17.89% of the respondents were uncertain or unlikely to continue teaching home economics next year.

Twenty-four respondents reported that they were either "unlikely" or "not at all likely" to be teaching home economics next year. The plans for next year as stated by respondents are summarized in Table 14. The most frequent plans reported for next year were to return to university (6), to devote time to family (6), or to teach a different subject (4).

Research Questions and Results

Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

The first research question concerned the sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among home economics teachers in their present work situation. The percentage of respondents satisfied and the mean and standard deviation on the eight items which rated high satisfaction are shown in Table 15. The mean for "overall satisfaction with teaching home economics" was 2.18 and ranked seventh in order according to means. Items with means which indicated high satisfaction tended to have the highest percentage of respondents satisfied. Generally, the high satisfaction items concerned freedom to select teaching methods and

Table 12

Respondents Classified by Home Economics Subject Areas Taught

Subject Area	Frequency	Percentage
Modern living	2	1.05
Clothing and textiles	19	10.00
Food science	29	15.26
Modern living and clothing and textiles	11	5.79
Modern living and food science	19	10.00
Clothing and textiles and food science	24	12.63
Clothing and textiles, modern living, and food science	86	45.26
Total	190	100.00

Table 13

Respondents Likelihood of Teaching Home Economics Next Year

Likelihood for Next Year	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all likely	16	8.42
Unlikely	8	4.21
Uncertain	10	5.26
Likely	36	18.95
Extremely likely	120	63.16
Total	190	100.00

Table 14

Plans for Those Unlikely to be Teaching
Home Economics Next Year

Stated Plans	Frequency
University	6
Family	6
Teach other subject	4
A different job	2
Retirement	2
Moving	2
No plans stated	2
Total	24

Table 15

Percentages of Respondents, Means and Standard Deviations on Items Showing Most Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage Satisfied
Freedom to select teaching methods	1.407	.598	97.35
Freedom to select subject matter	1.593	.733	92.60
The relationship with students	1.820	.666	92.06
The relationship with department head or principal	1.851	.850	88.82
The relationship with other teachers	1.857	.820	86.24
The average size of class you teach	1.963	.925	85.11
Overall satisfaction	2.185	.812	81.48
The salary you receive	2.222	.887	81.48

subject matter, interpersonal relationships, size of classes, and salary.

The percentages of responses, means and standard deviations on 11 questionnaire items showing the most dissatisfaction are listed in Table 16. Four items were above the mean of three and in the dissatisfaction range. These items however do not have as high percentage of respondents dissatisfied as do some of the other items which have lower means. The item which showed the highest percentage dissatisfied (56.67%) was "the availability of teacher aides to assist you". Ten participants did not respond to this item and some indicated that teacher aides were not employed in their school system. "Preparation time available to you during the official school day" was an item of dissatisfaction for 43.92% of the respondents and "the recognition which the profession gives for further non-university non-credit studies completed" was a dissatisfaction item for 42.24% of the respondents. Generally, other high dissatisfaction items concerned inservice education opportunities, pre-service education, the understanding which parents and other teachers have of home economics, and substitute teacher services.

In Table 24 (Appendix A) the percentage frequency distributions of responses in five categories, the mean and standard deviation for each job satisfaction item are listed. Table 17 reports the percentage of respondents in the contracted categories of satisfied (1 and 2) and dissatisfied (4 and 5), the total number of respondents and the mean for each item. The theoretical mean score, assuming a normal distribution of responses would be 3. Scores ranged from very satisfied (1) to very dissatisfied (5). A total of 38 items had mean scores of less than three, thus falling in the satisfied range.

Table 16

Percentages of Respondents, Means and Standard Deviations on Items Showing Most Dissatisfaction

Job Satisfaction Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage Satisfied
The availability of teacher aides to assist you	3.517	1.218	56.67
The recognition which the profession gives for further non-university, or non-credit studies completed	3.364	.929	42.24
The opportunity to take university credit courses	3.107	1.094	37.97
Your opportunity for promotion	3.005	.936	29.57
The extent to which your preservice teacher education prepared you for your teaching position	2.995	1.115	37.57
The preparation time available to you during the official school day	2.995	1.254	43.92
The understanding of home economics shown by other teachers in your school	2.947	1.007	34.92
The understanding which parents have of home economics	2.937	.880	29.47
The performance of substitute teacher services who teach your classes when absent	2.930	1.105	34.06
The opportunity to take further studies at a technical or community college	2.926	1.046	31.75
The opportunity for useful inservice education	2.894	1.054	32.28

Table 17

Number of Respondents, Percentages in Contracted Categories, and Mean for Each Job Satisfaction Item

Job Satisfaction Item	Number of Respondents	Mean	Percentage of Response 1 - 2*	Percentage of Response 4 - 5**
1. The average size of class you teach	188	1.963	85.11	12.23
2. Your freedom to select teaching methods	189	1.407	97.35	1.59
3. The prospect of classroom teaching as your lifetime career	188	2.601	47.34	16.49
4. Your freedom to select subject matter for your classes	189	1.593	92.60	3.70
5. The method by which students are assigned to your classes	188	2.691	54.25	29.79
6. The attitude of students to home economics	188	2.516	63.83	21.28
7. The intellectual stimulation you receive from your work	189	2.497	61.90	19.58
8. The encouragement to develop new and better ways of teaching	189	2.370	60.85	10.58
9. The preparation time available to you during the offical school day	189	2.995	48.14	43.92
10. The number of hours you teach per week	190	2.374	70.00	20.00
11. The non-teaching duties assigned to you per week	189	2.434	68.78	19.58
12. The time-tabling of your classes	189	2.334	70.90	18.00
13. The audiovisual resources available	189	2.402	67.73	21.69
14. The availability of teacher aides to assist you	180	3.517	25.00	56.67
15. The physical conditions of your classroom	189	2.783	56.09	37.56
16. The equipment and equipment maintenance provided	190	2.637	56.32	28.42
17. The present home economics curriculum	189	2.645	55.03	22.22

Table 17 (continued)

Job Satisfaction Item	Number of Respondents	Mean	Percentage of Response 1 - 2*	Percentage of Response 4 - 5**
18. The secretarial services available to assist you	187	2.294	74.33	20.86
19. The availability of substitute teacher services when you wish to be absent for professional activities	186	2.812	53.76	31.19
20. The performance of substitute teacher services who teacher your classes when absent	185	2.930	46.48	34.06
21. The methods of handling discipline problems in your school	189	2.513	62.43	24.34
22. The relationship with other teachers in your school	189	1.857	86.24	6.88
23. The proportion of the school budget available to home economics	190	2.342	71.06	16.84
24. The opportunity for budgetary decision making or control	189	2.497	62.43	23.81
25. The relationship with students	189	1.820	92.06	2.65
26. The opportunity for useful inservice	189	2.894	41.80	32.28
27. The extent to which your pre-service teacher education prepared you for your teaching position	189	2.995	40.74	37.57
28. The salary you receive	189	2.222	81.48	13.23
29. Your opportunity for promotion	186	3.005	35.48	29.57
30. The opportunity to take university credit courses	187	3.107	34.76	37.97
31. The opportunity to take further studies at a technical or community college	189	2.926	40.21	31.75
32. The recognition which the profession gives you for further non-university, or non-credit studies completed	187	3.364	15.51	42.24
33. The relationship with your department head or principal	188	1.851	88.82	6.92
34. The relationship with central office administrators	190	2.310	66.32	13.16
35. The availability of useful advice to assist you with problems you encounter in teaching	188	2.612	56.91	25.00

Table 17 (continued)

Job Satisfaction Item	Number of Respondents	Mean	Percentage of Response 1 - 2*	Percentage of Response 4 - 5**
36. The understanding of home economics shown by other teachers in your school	189	2.947	41.27	34.92
37. The understanding which parents have of home economics	190	2.937	37.37	29.47
38. The understanding which administrators of your school have of home economics	189	2.460	63.49	18.52
39. The availability of assistance to help you with problems specific to the teaching of home economics	188	2.750	47.87	27.66
40. The opportunity to communicate with other home economics teachers	190	2.642	60.00	25.79
41. The recognition you receive from your work	189	2.735	51.32	26.45
42. Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with teaching home economics at the present time	189	2.185	81.48	11.11

* 1 - 2 means either very satisfied or satisfied.

** 4 - 5 means either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Changes Which Will Improve Satisfaction

The purpose of the open-ended question was to allow participants to either add emphasis to certain dissatisfaction items included in the questionnaire or to include factors which may have been omitted from the questionnaire. Respondents were asked what changes in the next five years would do most to improve one's satisfaction with teaching home economics. The question was asked in reference to: (a) "your present situation", and (b) "in general (in Alberta)". A total of 160 (84%) participants responded to this open-ended question. Desirable changes stated by respondents were categorized and the most frequently listed are reported in Table 18.

Changes most frequently desired in the present situation concerned facilities, class size, budget, not enough time, more preparation time, equipment, teacher aides, and the dislike of teaching other classes. The most frequently desired change concerned facilities, being mentioned by 25 respondents. Actual statements were "a better lab", "upgrading", and "redesign". Equipment was mentioned a total of 11 times. Desired changes concerning equipment were described as "better, more up to date" and "more equipment".

Listed by 23 respondents, class size was the next most frequently desired change. Changes mentioned were "smaller classes" and "strict restrictions" on numbers. The maximum number of students desired ranged from 16 to 24.

Changes to increase budget amounts and administration of budgets was mentioned by 18 of the respondents. Desired changes concerning budget were stated as desire to "handle myself", "more information", presently having "no control". Several respondents mentioned the

Table 18

Changes Which Will Improve Satisfaction With Teaching

Desired Change	Frequency
Facilities	25
Class Size	23
Curriculum	22
Understanding of home economics	22
Budget	18
Not enough time	13
More inservice	12
More preparation time	11
Equipment	11

problem of inflation and the difficulties this caused particularly in purchasing food supplies.

Changes in the amount of time for home economics instruction were listed by 13 respondents. Changes were desired in the length of class time as well as the total time allotted to home economics. A change in the amount of preparation time was also desired by 11 respondents. Five respondents specifically mentioned the need for additional preparation time for food science teachers.

The opportunity to have teacher aides was mentioned as a desired change by nine respondents. The desire not to teach classes other than home economics was mentioned by seven respondents.

Changes most frequently desired in general (in Alberta) concerned curriculum, the understanding of home economics and inservice. A total of 22 respondents desired changes in curriculum. Others were more specific, detailing the type of curriculum change they would like. Eight respondents desired a "more specific" curriculum. Comments were made concerning whether home economics should be compulsory or optional. One respondent stated "home economics is an option - although the course content is certainly not optional in everyday life". Three respondents stated that home economics in junior high should be compulsory while two stated that it should be optional. One respondent called for one compulsory year of modern living in high school.

Comments were made concerning the theoretical and practical approaches of home economics. Comments included "I think that students would much rather do things than talk about things" and "I see nothing wrong with learning 'how to sew' and 'how to cook'". One respondent stated "I thoroughly dislike the cooking and sewing image and yet at

junior high, the practical labs are enjoyed so much". One respondent would like "a program initiated for lower ability students"; while two respondents would like vocational programs to be developed. A difficulty was recognized in the "relationship of home economics to other curriculum". One respondent called for a change in course name. Modern living was mentioned by several respondents. Two disliked modern living, one wanted a "change in modern living", one wanted "modern living as a separate course" and two wanted modern living "expanded".

A total of 22 respondents would like changes to occur in the understanding of home economics. Comments included "better attitude of students, parents, and staff towards home economics", "recognition from school administration", and "better public understanding". Three respondents desired "more recognition of modern living". One respondent expressed the desire "that home economics become recognized as an important force (health and life skills) in the life of individual communities".

More inservice was desired by 12 respondents. Comments included "time for professional development" and "to be able to take more training in curriculum and subject area". Additional comments were made by respondents concerning inservice. Two respondents desired "credit courses closer than Edmonton", five desired courses in home economics "in Calgary". Eight respondents wanted "more sharing between teachers in (local) area". Other comments included "more travelling home economics workshops", "conferences accessible to all teachers in the province", "province wide exchange of ideas", and "more workshops when curriculum is introduced".

Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between demographic variables and overall job

satisfaction was analyzed by testing the hypotheses outlined in Chapter III. Overall job satisfaction scores were provided from the response to item 42 in the job satisfaction section of the Survey Form. Responses to this item were related to the data provided in the demographic section of the Survey Form.

Hypothesis 1:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction for teachers in different experience categories.

Respondents were grouped into three categories: 1-4 years experience in teaching home economics, 5-9 years, and 10 years or more. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 26 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance was used on the three groups to determine if the difference in scores among the groups were significant. No significant difference in the overall job satisfaction scores were found for the three groups (Table 27, Appendix A). A further comparison was made of the percentages of respondents satisfied in smaller categories of years of home economics teaching experience and is reported in Table 28 (Appendix A).

Hypothesis 2:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers in different subject area experience categories.

Respondents were grouped into two categories according to whether their total years of experience had been only in home economics or whether their total years also included experience in teaching some other subject area. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 29 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance was used to determine any

difference between the groups. No significant difference was found (Table 30, Appendix A).

Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers with different education levels.

Respondents were grouped into two categories based on years of academic training for which they were evaluated for salary purposes. The descriptive statistics for the two categories of 1-4 years and 5 or 6 years is summarized in Table 31 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance was used to examine the difference in scores between the two groups (Table 32, Appendix A). No significant difference was found at .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis 4:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers differing in university major.

Respondents were grouped according to whether their subject area major at university had been home economics or another major. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 33 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance was used to examine the difference in scores between the two groups. The findings are reported in Table 34 (Appendix A). No significant difference was found.

Hypothesis 5:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for different categories of location of university training.

Respondents were grouped into two categories: (a) those who have obtained most of their university training in Alberta, and (b) those who have obtained most of their training outside of Alberta. Descriptive

statistics are reported in Table 35 (Appendix A). Analysis of variance was used to study the difference between scores and is reported in Table 36 (Appendix A). No significant difference in the overall job satisfaction scores were found for the two groups.

Hypothesis 6:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for teachers in different sizes of population centers.

Respondents replied as to whether the size of population center in which their school is located was less than 10,000, 10,000-25,000 or over 25,000. Responses indicated that those whose schools were in centers of less than 10,000 were 72, 14 were in centers of 10,000-25,000 and 104 were in centers of over 25,000. Since few respondents were in the medium size population centers, for computing the analysis of variance, respondents were divided into two categories according to size of population center: (a) 25,000 or less, and (b) more than 25,000. Those respondents in centers of over 25,000 would be those in the major urban centers of Alberta, mostly in either Edmonton or Calgary.

Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 37 (Appendix A). Analysis of variance was used to examine the difference in overall job satisfaction between the two groups. The findings are summarized in Table 38 (Appendix A). No significant difference was found in overall job satisfaction between the two groups.

Hypothesis 7:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores between teachers in different age categories.

Respondents were divided into three age categories: 20-27 years, 28-35 years, and 36-60 years. Descriptive statistics are reported in

Table 39 (Appendix A). Analysis of variance was used to examine the differences among overall job satisfaction scores. No significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores were found for the three groups (Table 40, Appendix A). However, interesting differences were noted in percentages satisfied when respondents were categorized into smaller age groupings. Table 41 (Appendix A) reports the percentage of respondents satisfied in categories of five year age spans.

Hypothesis 8:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores between groups of differing parental status.

Respondents were divided into two categories: those having no children and those having one or more children. The descriptive statistics are shown in Table 42 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance found no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for the two groups (Table 43, Appendix A).

Hypothesis 9:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores among groups having different numbers of professional association memberships.

Respondents were divided into groups holding memberships in two or fewer, three, and more than three professional associations. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 44 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance found no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for the three groups (Table 45, Appendix A).

Hypothesis 10:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores among groups having different levels of professional activity.

Total professional activity scores were calculated for each respondent, based on responses to item 10 in the demographic section of the Survey Form. Respondents were grouped into three categories of professional activity, based on total scores of two or less than two, three or four, and more than four. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 46 (Appendix A). Analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of difference in scores among the groups. No significant difference was found in overall job satisfaction scores for the three groups (Table 47, Appendix A).

Hypothesis 11:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for groups at different levels of teaching assignment.

Respondents were grouped according to whether their teaching assignment was junior high only, senior high only, or a combination of junior/senior high. Descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 48 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance found no significant difference in job satisfaction scores among the three groups (Table 49, Appendix A).

Hypothesis 12:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores for groups having different home economics content in teaching assignment.

Respondents were grouped into three categories based on whether they taught one of the three content areas in home economics, two content areas, or three content areas. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 50 (Appendix A). An analysis of variance found no significant difference in job satisfaction scores among the three groups

(Table 51, Appendix A).

Hypothesis 13:

There is no significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores between groups who are likely or unlikely to be teaching home economics next year.

Respondents were grouped into two categories based on whether they were likely or extremely likely to be teaching home economics next year or whether they were uncertain, unlikely, or not at all likely.

Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 19. More respondents (81.58%) were likely or extremely likely to be teaching home economics next year, compared to 18.42% of the respondents who were uncertain or unlikely to be teaching home economics next year. Although both groups showed dissatisfaction the group uncertain or unlikely to remain in home economics teaching next year did show considerably more dissatisfaction than those likely to remain.

An analysis of variance found a significant difference ($p = .01$) between the means of the two groups and is illustrated in Table 20. This finding indicates that significantly more of those teachers who are dissatisfied are leaving than are remaining as home economics teachers.

The group of respondents unlikely to be teaching home economics next year were of particular interest and further analysis were done with the self-esteem scores, years of home economics teaching experience and years of training of this group. Table 52 (Appendix A) summarizes the years of home economics teaching experience of this group. Twenty (83.33%) of this group of 24 unlikely to teach home economics next year had ten or fewer years of experience. Slightly more than half (62.50%) had seven or fewer years of experience. Table 53 (Appendix A), summarizes

Table 19

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Likelihood of Teaching Home Economics Next Year

	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
Unlikely, uncertain or not at all likely	35	24	68.57	2.49	1.011
Likely, or extremely likely	155	130	83.87	2.10	.766

Table 20

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Likelihood of Teaching Home Economics Next Year

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	df	F
Between	4.177	4.18	1	6.28*
Within	125.091	.67	188	
Total	129.268		189	

* p = .01

the years of training of this group. The percentage of this group having four years training (62.50%) was comparable to the total group percentage of 66.84%. A slightly larger percentage of this group (33.33%) had five years training than the total group (25.80%).

Self-esteem scores for the group unlikely to be teaching home economics next year are reported in Table 54 (Appendix A). A slightly smaller percentage of this group (50%) scored zero (high self-esteem) than the larger study group (58.42%). However, more scored one (45.83%) than in the larger group (37.74%). The group unlikely to be teaching home economics next year had no respondents in the medium self-esteem range, however the one respondent in the low self-esteem range was from this group.

Self-esteem and Job Satisfaction

The relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction was analyzed through the use of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The self-rating section of the Survey Form was scored to provide a final self-esteem score, with a possible range of 0-6 for each respondent. This self-esteem score was related to each item in the job satisfaction section of the Survey Form. Scores for respondents on the self-rating scale indicated a generally high level of self-esteem and are summarized in Table 21. Scores ranged from 0-5 and the mean was .51.

Hypothesis 14:

There is no significant correlation between overall job satisfaction scores and self-esteem scores.

Table 21

Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Classified by Scores Obtained on the Self-Rating Scale

Score	Frequency	Percentage
0	111	58.42
1	66	34.74
2	10	5.26
3	2	1.05
4	-	-
5	1	.53
6	-	-
Total	190	100.00

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to describe the degree of relation between self-esteem scores and overall job satisfaction. A significant correlation was found between self-esteem scores and job satisfaction at the .01 level ($p = .002$). The correlation coefficient and level of significance between the self-esteem variable and each job satisfaction variable is reported in Table 55, Appendix A.

Hypothesis 15:

There is no signifciant correlation between items of job satisfaction and self-esteem scores.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was also used to analyze the relationship between self-esteem scores and each item of job satisfaction in the job satisfaction questionnaire of the Survey Form. The correlation coefficients and level of significance are reported in Table 55, Appendix A. Those job satisfaction items showing a significant correlation ($p \leq .05$) to self-esteem concerned: average size of class, availability of substitute services, attitude of students, intellectual stimulation, prospect of teaching as a lifetime career, relationship with students, opportunity to take university credit courses or to take further studies at technical or community colleges, recognition that the profession gives for further non-university, non-credit studies, salary and overall satisfaction. These significant correlations indicate that those respondents highly satisfied with these 11 items also tended to be high in self-esteem.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The main objectives of this study were to examine the sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among home economics teachers in Alberta and to analyze the relationship between selected demographic variables, self-esteem and overall job satisfaction of teachers.

A Survey Form was mailed to a random sample of 235 Alberta home economics teachers during May, 1979. A total of 190 useable responses were obtained. The Survey Form consisted of three parts: a job satisfaction questionnaire, a self-rating scale, and a demographic questionnaire. The self-rating scale used was the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The job satisfaction and demographic questionnaires were designed for this study.

Respondents indicated high satisfaction with freedom to select teaching methods and subject matter, relationships with students, administrators and other teachers, size of class, salary and overall job satisfaction. High dissatisfaction was indicated on items concerning: availability of teacher aides, pre-service and inservice education, the opportunity for promotion, preparation time and the understanding which parents and other teachers have of home economics. A significant correlation ($p = .002$) was found between overall job satisfaction and self-esteem of respondents. An analysis of variance was used to study the relationship between the demographic variables and job satisfaction. A statistically significant difference ($p = .01$) was found in job satisfaction between the groups of respondents who were likely and unlikely to continue teaching home economics next year.

Discussion

The findings from this survey will be discussed under the following headings: sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, relationship between demographic variables and job satisfaction, and relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction.

Sources of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

The highest percentages of respondents who checked either "satisifed" or "very satisfied" on the job satisfaction questionnaire occurred on items concerning: (1) freedom to select teaching methods and subject matter for your classes (2) relationship with other teachers, with students, and with department head or principal (3) average size of class you teach (4) overall satisfaction, and (5) salary. These five factors were found to be sources of satisfaction for over 80% of the respondents (Table 24, Appendix A). The finding of relationships with other teachers, with students, and with department head or principal as a source of satisfaction is supported by Wickstrom (1973) and Holdaway (1978). Holdaway (1978) also found teachers highly satisfied with their freedom to select teaching methods and subject matter for classes. Although "average size of class taught" was a source of satisfaction to a large percentage of the respondents in this study, it did rank as the second most frequently mentioned item in the open-ended question as an item which teachers would like changed. This may indicate the degree of importance that this factor holds for teachers who experience class size as a source of dissatisfaction.

Although a job satisfaction item may have a high percentage of respondents satisfied, the importance of this item to respondents is not

known nor is the effect of the interaction of other items. For example, although respondents indicated high satisfaction with freedom to select teaching methods and subject matter, items of high dissatisfaction such as preparation time or facilities may limit the complete realization of satisfaction associated with those freedoms. Mann (1977) found that the factors of teacher preparation time, school program scheduling and class loads were significant in determining the use of teaching techniques. Thus it may be that a source of satisfaction is eliminated by a factor of dissatisfaction.

The highest percentage of respondents who checked either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" occurred on items concerning: (1) availability of teacher aides (2) preparation time (3) recognition which the profession gives for non-university, non-credit study (4) physical conditions of the classroom (5) opportunity to take university credit courses, and (6) the extent to which pre-service teacher education prepared one for the present teaching position. These factors were a source of dissatisfaction for more than 37% of the respondents (Table 21, Appendix A). Teacher aides, preparation time, and physical conditions of the classroom were also frequently mentioned as desired changes by respondents. A frequent response also to the open-ended question related to inservice, tending to support items (5) and (6) as dissatisfiers. Bowen (1974) in a study of 125 junior high home economics teachers found 89% wanted more inservice. In this study, only 41.80% were satisfied with the opportunity for useful inservice.

The sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction found in the study tended not to support Herzberg's (1959, 1966) theory of motivation-hygiene factors. That is, for this group of home economics teachers, factors such as salary and interpersonal relations contributed to

satisfaction rather than dissatisfaction as hypothesized by Herzberg. Most items in the questionnaire were sources of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction for respondents.

Responses to the open-ended question asking which changes would most improve one's job satisfaction in the next five years tended to repeat items included in the job satisfaction questionnaire rather than to provide additional items as sources of dissatisfaction. Thus, the desired changes of respondents are likely to indicate the importance of a factor as a dissatisfier.

With a mean age of 32 for respondents and a mean of 7.24 years of home economics teaching experience, the numbers of teachers leaving home economics teaching is apparent. Only 47.34% of the respondents indicated satisfaction with the prospect of classroom teaching as a lifetime career. The finding of 35.48% satisfied with the opportunity of promotion suggests that many may find the career pattern of a teacher less than anticipated. The present satisfaction expressed may imply that the position is satisfactory for the time being. The effects of this relatively short time commitment to the profession can be expected to have an impact on the subject area.

Pre-service and inservice education were notable concerns of the respondents of this study. Only 40.74% expressed satisfaction with the extent to which pre-service teacher education prepared them for their teaching position. The demographic data provided information on the professional activities of respondents during the past two years and indicated that respondents were participants in credit and non-credit courses as well as conferences and workshops. Only 34.76% of the respondents were satisfied with their present opportunities to take university credit courses. Only 15.51% were satisfied with the recognition

which the profession gives for further non-university or non-credit studies and this may be due to the non-recognition which is made of the various professional activities in which these respondents participate.

Finally, those items with which fewer respondents are dissatisfied are also worthy of note. Items such as "the present home economics curriculum" and "the availability of assistance to help you with problems specific to the teaching of home economics" reported percentages satisfied of 55.03% and 47.84% respectively. When one considers the nature of the items, the possible impact of even low percentages of dissatisfaction is important.

Relationship Between Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction

Experience

Although no significant difference was found between the mean scores of groups in different categories according to years of experience in teaching home economics, some differences were evident among the percentages of respondents satisfied in each category. The most satisfied group of teachers were those with 5-9 years of experience (Table 26, Appendix A); the least satisfied were the group with 10 years or more of experience. This is an opposite finding to Clarke (1968) and Karalot (1971) who found higher levels of dissatisfaction among inexperienced or beginning teachers. The dissatisfaction of the group with 1-4 years of experience in this study may be explained by the higher aspirations and the consequent disillusion of the beginning teacher, as found in the study by Mitchell et al. (1968).

However, the high dissatisfaction among the group with ten years or more of experience is more difficult to account for but may be due in

part to the changes which have occurred in home economics, teaching and society during this more lengthy career span.

No significant difference in job satisfaction was found for teachers who had teaching experience in addition to home economics when compared to those who had only home economics experience. Both groups were similar in percentages satisfied and mean scores. This finding indicates that having experience in some other subject area of teaching has little influence on job satisfaction with teaching home economics.

Education Level

The analysis of variance indicated no significant difference in overall job satisfaction for respondents in different categories of years of training. A comparison of the percentages satisfied in each group found that those having one to four years of training had the higher percentage satisfied (86.15%). Of the group having 5-6 years of training, 74.58% expressed overall satisfaction. This finding is supported by Holdaway (1978) who found overall satisfaction tended to decline for those with two or more bachelor's degrees.

University Major

An analysis of variance found no significant difference between the group who had home economics as their subject area major at university and the group who did not. A comparison of the percentage satisfied in each group showed that the group of teachers who had home economics as their university major had 82.32% expressing overall satisfaction. Those who had a university major other than home economics had 75% satisfied. This finding is in agreement with that of Holdaway (1978) who found teachers teaching in their area of training to be more satisfied.

Location of University Training

The analysis of variance indicated no significant difference in satisfaction for respondents in different categories according to where university training was obtained. Very little difference was also found in the percentages satisfied for each group. The group who had obtained their training outside of Alberta, showed 80.77% satisfied while the group who had obtained their training in Alberta showed 81.16% satisfied. Only 40.74% of the respondents were satisfied with the extent to which their university training prepared them for their present position. This finding could indicate a general dissatisfaction with university training, since where home economics teachers obtain their training appears to have little influence on the degree of job satisfaction.

Population Center Size

No significant difference in satisfaction was found from the analysis of variance between different categories of respondents grouped according to size of population center in which their school is located. A comparison of the percentage satisfied in each category showed that those teachers whose schools were located in population centers larger than 25,000 showed slightly less satisfaction (78.85%) than those living in centers of less than 25,000 (83.72%). This finding is similar to that of Holdaway (1978) who found those living in large centers to be slightly less satisfied than those in smaller centers. The slightly higher dissatisfaction for larger centers is attributed to the complexity of larger urban schools and school systems. Holdaway (1978) found teachers in the large urban centers were less satisfied with preparation time, class size, availability of teacher aides, status of teachers and performance of on-call substitute teachers.

Age

The analysis of variance found no significant difference in satisfaction for respondents in different categories according to age. However, the more detailed comparison of overall job satisfaction for respondents grouped in five year age span categories revealed possible changes in satisfaction for different ages. The categories indicating higher percentages satisfied were ages 20-24 (81.82%), ages 30-34 (82.50%), 45-49 (100%) and 50-54 (90.00%). The categories indicating lower percentages satisfied were 25-29 years (75.44%), 35-39 years (77.27%), 40-44 years (71.43%) and 55-60 (57.14%) (Table 41, Appendix A).

In comparing numbers and percentages of respondents satisfied in categories of experience with the age categories, a similar pattern is not evident according to years of experience. One might expect many women's teaching careers to include some years away from classroom teaching and therefore not to be comparable to age. The lowest percentage of respondents satisfied (60.00%) was in the experience category of 16-20 years.

Karalot (1971) and Okonkwo (1966) found job satisfaction to increase with age. However, indications are in this study that the relationship between job satisfaction and age may not be linear since highest satisfaction occurred for respondents in their early twenties, early thirties, and from ages 45-54.

Parental Status

An analysis of variance yielded no significant difference in satisfaction between respondents who were parents and those who were not. A comparison of percentages satisfied in each category indicated

that those teachers with children showed slightly more satisfaction (81.25%) than those without children (80.91%). Parental status appears to have little influence on the level of job satisfaction for home economics teachers.

Professional Involvement

No significant difference was found in the satisfaction for those respondents in different categories according to number of professional association memberships or according to different levels of professional activity. A comparison of the percentages satisfied in each category according to number of professional association memberships indicated that the group holding three professional association memberships were most satisfied (85.08%). The group holding two or less than two memberships were the least satisfied (78.49%) and those holding more than three memberships were 80% satisfied. The relationship between professional activity and overall satisfaction showed a decrease in satisfaction with increase in activity. Respondents were divided into groups having total activity scores of two or less than two, three or four, and four or more. The percentage satisfied in each group was 85.48%, 81.82% and 74.51% respectively. Thus satisfaction appeared to be highest for those with a medium level of professional association memberships and for those with a low level of participation in professional activities.

Teaching Level

The analysis of variance between respondents in different categories according to level of teaching assignment found no statistically significant difference. A comparison of the percentage satisfied in each category showed that those teachers teaching senior high only were

least satisfied (75%) while those teaching a combination of junior and senior high showed most satisfaction (89.23%). The percentage satisfied among those teaching junior high only was 78.08%. This finding is consistent with Holdaway (1978) who found satisfaction tended to decline with increasing grade level.

Although the percent satisfied in each of the three categories used in the analysis of variance differ considerably, the mean scores for each group were relatively similar. Interestingly, those teachers teaching both junior and senior high levels indicated the highest percentage satisfied when one might expect the opposite finding due to the increase in time such a combination teaching assignment may require. Some possible explanation might be that this combination allows a teacher to develop a more lengthy relationship with students or to experience more variety in subject matter, method and age of student.

Home Economics Subject Area in Teaching Assignment

No significant difference was found in satisfaction among respondents grouped according to whether they taught one home economics subject area, two, or three. A comparison of percentages satisfied in each of the three groups were 76%, 85.19%, and 81.40% respectively. The teachers whose assignment contained only one home economics subject area could be teaching only food science, or clothing and textiles, or modern living. Teachers whose assignment involved only one subject area are most likely to be teaching at the senior high level where each of the three subject areas are separate courses. That those teachers teaching in one subject area only were least satisfied tends to be consistent with the previous findings that teachers teaching at senior high were less satisfied. Teachers whose teaching assignment consisted of two

home economics subject areas showed the highest percentage satisfied (85.19%) while those having an assignment of three subject areas were 81.40% satisfied. Those respondents teaching in two or more home economics subject areas were most likely to be junior high or a combination of junior and senior high teachers.

Plans for Next Year

An analysis of variance found a significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores between groups who were likely or unlikely to be teaching home economics next year. Sergiovanni (1975) suggested that teachers who were dissatisfied with their jobs were now less likely to leave the profession. However, this significant finding does not support Sergiovanni's suggestion and indicates that those home economics teachers who are dissatisfied are less likely to remain teaching home economics.

Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Job Satisfaction

Overall job satisfaction among home economics teachers was high (81.48%). Overall self-esteem was also found to be high. Rosenberg (1965) classified high, medium, and low self-esteem as zero to one, two, and three to six, respectively. According to these categories, the teachers in this study having high self-esteem were 93.16%; medium, 5.26%; and low self-esteem, 1.58%. This does not support Lortie's (1970) suggestion that teachers have a deficit of self-esteem. This is not a surprising finding as one might expect a high level of self-esteem which is related to healthy behavior and good adjustment among teachers. If work is the focus of identity and worth as suggested by Gurin et al., (1960), one might expect high self-esteem to be related to high job

satisfaction.

A significant correlation ($p = .002$) was found between self-esteem and job satisfaction. Wurtz (1972) in his study of the relationship between job satisfaction and self concept of education employees also found a significant correlation. Schultz (1975) in a study of college faculty members in home economics also found a significant correlation between job satisfaction and self-concept.

Gergen (1977) proposed that the job provides feedback on one's worth and competence, thus contributing to self-esteem. It is interesting to note the job satisfaction items which correlated significantly ($p \leq .05$) with both self-esteem and overall job satisfaction. These items were: the prospect of classroom teaching as a lifetime career, attitude of students, relationship with students, intellectual stimulation and salary. These five job satisfaction items may indicate some possible sources of feedback on worth, competence and thus self-esteem for this group of respondents.

Conclusions

The data provided by respondents in this study showed a high level of job satisfaction among home economics teachers. Freedom to make decisions regarding subject matter and methods, interpersonal relationships, and salary ranked highly as sources of satisfaction. All these items also correlated significantly ($p \leq .05$) with overall job satisfaction. Although a high percentage of respondents indicated satisfaction with "average size of class", it was also highly rated as an item which teachers would like to see changed and did not significantly correlate ($p \leq .05$) with overall satisfaction.

Teacher aides, preparation time, and physical conditions of the classroom as well as inservice and pre-service education were high dissatisfiers. These factors were also frequently listed by teachers as being items which would most improve satisfaction if changed in the next five years.

Job satisfaction was found to correlate significantly ($p = .002$) with self-esteem of home economics teachers. A significant difference in overall job satisfaction scores between groups likely and unlikely to be teaching home economics next year was also found. This finding indicated that a significantly larger proportion of those teachers who are dissatisfied are leaving rather than remaining as home economics teachers. The demographic data concerning teaching assignment, teaching experience, location and years of training, location of school, professional involvement, age, and parental status revealed no statistically significant differences among the various groups of respondents. It can be concluded that these demographic variables are not good indicators of job satisfaction among home economics teachers.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study provide a basis of understanding the factors related to satisfaction or dissatisfaction for home economics teachers and have implications for persons concerned with home economics education in Alberta. Specific implications and recommendations are proposed for school administrators, the Department of Education, the Faculty of Education, the Home Economics Specialist Council, home economics teachers and for further research.

School Administrators

The availability of teacher aides was a source of dissatisfaction for many home economics teachers. In addition, many were dissatisfied with the amount of preparation time available to them during the day. The use of teacher aides is one means of providing additional time for home economics teachers, by freeing them from many routine tasks which para-professional personnel could assume and thereby enabling teachers to direct their time and energies to other tasks such as public relations and inservice education. Efforts could also be directed at improving the quality of substitute teacher services available in the school systems.

Inservice education opportunities provided by school systems could be examined. More opportunity for sharing between teachers in the local area was a change desired by many teachers. To improve the opportunity for local inservice education, time needs to be made available to teachers and local home economics coordinators appointed with responsibility for organizing and directing these professional development activities. Many teachers were dissatisfied with the opportunities for promotion. Home economics teachers should not be overlooked for promotion because of false stereotypes which may be held toward either the subject area or females in education.

Other important changes of local jurisdiction which home economics teachers desire concern facilities and equipment, class size and budgeting practices. Home economics teachers desired more control and involvement in budgeting.

The condition of facilities and equipment in home economics departments was a frequent concern. Poor conditions can be a limiting factor

in providing a quality program in home economics. The facilities in a home economics room must be able to accommodate the size of class assigned to that facility and allow for learning to occur in a constructive, organized, and safe environment.

The Alberta Department of Education

Frequently listed by respondents as desirable changes were curriculum, the understanding which others have of home economics and more inservice. Many concerns have been stated regarding curriculum and all emphasize the need for an assessment and possible clarification or redirection of curriculum. The provision of more inservice when new curriculum is introduced was requested. The extent of dissatisfaction regarding curriculum could also be an indication of some difficulties with past curriculum implementation practices.

Public relations to improve the understanding of home economics was also a concern of home economics teachers. Home economics can provide students with basic life skills and the promoting of it as a practical and valuable course for all students is desired.

Faculty of Education

Dissatisfaction with both pre-service and inservice education was high among home economics teachers. Many expressed dissatisfaction with the extent to which pre-service teacher education prepared them for their teaching position. The evaluation of pre-service teacher education programs in an effort to continually improve such programs is necessary. Home economics teachers distant from major universities have requested improvements in the availability of university credit courses as well as increasing the availability of non-credit study.

The Home Economics Specialist Council

The Home Economics Specialist Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association could work jointly with the Department of Education and Faculty of Education representatives to determine specific inservice needs and to develop appropriate programs. Also by itself or jointly, this Specialist Council should direct efforts to activities and policies promoting the understanding of home economics among teachers, administrators, parents, and students.

Teachers of Home Economics

Teachers can influence improvements within their own school systems. Inservice education, changes in school policy, and the promotion of home economics are areas in which teachers can be instrumental in initiating and implementing desirable changes. Beyond possible individual efforts, professional organizations such as the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Home Economics Specialist Council, and the Alberta Home Economics Association provide a vehicle through which individual teachers can be heard or organized to bring about change. The active participation in all such organizations by home economics teachers is strongly recommended as teachers should involve themselves in changes which affect them professionally.

Additional Recommendations

Teachers working in the isolation of classrooms and under the pressures of time cannot be left the responsibility of changing the dissatisfying conditions of teaching. Cooperative efforts toward planned action is one possible solution. Representatives of the Faculty of Education, Alberta Department of Education, the Home Economics Specialist

Council and supervisors of Home Economics would benefit through regular discussion and cooperative action on the major challenges facing home economics education. Joint action is necessary to seek solutions to problems such as useful inservice, credit and non-credit study opportunities for home economics teachers. A means of recognizing the participation of teachers in professional activities can provide motivation and encouragement for teachers to develop and remain within the profession.

Suggestions for Further Research

Several possible areas for further research are suggested by the findings of this study. Further research is recommended to:

1. Examine teacher effectiveness as well as job satisfaction and self-esteem to further explore the relationship among these variables.

2. Investigate teacher dissatisfaction and the factors related to decisions to remain or leave home economics teaching.

3. Replicate this study in several years to monitor changes in job satisfaction of home economics teachers. This would be of particular interest if actions were taken to improve satisfaction according to the recommendations of this study.

4. Add a valuing dimension to each job satisfaction item in this or an alternate questionnaire in a similar study. This would allow satisfaction items to be weighted according to the importance ascribed to each by each subject and thus provide an added dimension to the understanding of job satisfaction.

5. Repeat a similar study with a specific target group rather than a random sample. An indepth study of subjects in certain age, experience, or subject area categories would provide an understanding of

the needs peculiar to the specific group(s).

6. Investigate the aspirations or career commitment of home economics teachers. Such a study may provide insight to the reasons for the considerable rate at which home economics teachers leave the profession.

Home economics teachers in Alberta are young, well trained, recently trained and professionally active. This study has indicated many sources of dissatisfaction which they experience in their work situation and may provide some clues as to why they leave home economics teaching. For home economics teachers, administrators, and persons working in home economics education, recommendations have suggested joint action in an effort to improve the work situation. The findings have provided a basis for understanding job satisfaction and have indicated changes needed to retain motivated, growing and committed home economics teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Education. Goals of basic education for Alberta. Alberta Education, 1977.

American Vocational Association. Factors affecting the satisfactions of home economics teachers (Research bulletin No. 3). Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1948.

Babbie, E. Survey research methods. California: Wadsworth, 1973.

Belasco, J.A., and Alutto, J. Decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1972, 8, 44-58.

Bowen, S. Attitudes of teachers toward modern living. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1974.

Brinkman, M.J. Factors related to teacher morale in three junior high schools. Humanities and Social Sciences, 1967, 27, 2301-2309.

Carlson, R. On the structure of self-esteem: comments on Ziller's formulation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 264-268.

Chase, F.S. The factors productive of satisfaction in teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, 1952.

Compton, N.H. and Hall, O.A. Foundations of home economics research. Minneapolis: Burgess, 1972.

Coombs, A.W. The human aspects of administration. Educational Leadership, 1970, 28(2), 197-205.

Coopersmith, S. The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: Freeman, 1967.

Edwards, A.L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1957.

Ferguson, G.A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Fox, D.J. The research process in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Francoeur, K. Factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the teaching profession. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1963.

Friedlander, F. Job characteristics as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 388-392.

Getzels, J.W. and Guba, E.G. Social behaviour and the administrative process. School Review, 1957, 65, 429-438.

Gergen, K.J. The social construction of self-knowledge. In T. Mischel (Ed.), The self: psychological and philosophical issues. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, S. Americans view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Haggarty, J. Job satisfaction of teachers in vocational education. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1974.

Helmstadter, G.C. Research concepts in human behavior. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., and Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World, 1966.

Hewitson, M.T. The professional satisfaction of beginning teachers. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Alberta, 1975.

Holdaway, E.A. Teacher satisfaction: an Alberta report. University of Alberta, Department of Education Administration, 1978.

Huang, M.W. Professional attitudes, commitment, and selected demographic variables as indicators of home economists' employment satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ohio State University, 1976.

Karalot, H. Job satisfaction of teachers in comprehensive schools of Saskatchewan. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1971.

Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Lawler, E.E. and Porter, L.W. The effect of performance on job satisfaction. Industrial Relations, 1967, 7, 20-28.

Leedy, P.D. Practical research: planning and design. New York: MacMillan, 1974.

Locke, E. What is job satisfaction? Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1969, 4, 309-336.

Lortie, D.C. Observations on teaching as work. In R. Travers (Ed.), Handbook of research in teaching (Vol. 2). Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Lortie, D.C. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Mann, L. Teachers of home economics perceptions of teaching techniques. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1977.

Maslow, A.H. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper, 1954.

Mead, G.H. Mind, self and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Mitchell, S., Warren, C., and Clarke, S.C.T. Profile of Alberta teachers: expectations and heightened aspirations. Edmonton: Alberta Teachers' Association, 1968.

Mumford, E. Job satisfaction - a study of computer specialists. London: Longman Group, 1972.

Okonkwo, A. A study of teachers' attitudes and their relation to work satisfaction. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1966.

Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation. The effect of sexism on the career development of teachers. 1976.

Plican, J. Attitudes towards secondary home economics. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta, 1975.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self image. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Rosenberg, M. Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Schultz, D. Pyschology and industry today. New York: MacMillan Company, 1973.

Schultz, J. Job satisfaction, life satisfaction and self-concept of home economics college faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Iowa State University, 1975.

Sergiovanni, T. Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. Journal of Educational Administration, 1967, 5, 66-82.

Sergiovanni, T. Professional supervision for professional teachers. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

Silber, E., and Tippett, J. Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 1017-1071.

Spitze, H., and Minish, R. Why don't we teacher as well as we know how? Illinois Teacher, 1977, 3-4.

Super, D., Starishevsky, R., Matlin, N., and Jordaan, J. Career development: Self-concept Theory. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Wells, L.E. and Marwell, G. Self-esteem - its conceptualization and measurement. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.

Wickstrom, R.A. Sources of teacher job satisfaction. Canadian Administrator, 1973, 31, 1-5.

Wurtz, P. An investigation of the multiple effects of self-concept and other independent variables in the prediction of teacher job satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Kansas, 1972.

Wylie, R. The self-concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Yamamoto, K. and Wiersma, J. Rejection of self and deviant others among student teachers. The Journal of Special Education, 1967, 1, 401-408.

Ziller, R. The alienation syndrome: A triadic pattern of self - other orientation. Sociometry, 1969, 32, 287-300.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 22

Number and Percentages of Respondents Classifed by Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Age	Frequency	Percentage
21	2	1.08	41	1	.54
22	4	2.16	42	2	1.08
23	8	4.32	43	1	.54
24	19	10.27	44	-	-
25	10	5.40	45	3	1.63
26	12	6.49	46	1	.54
27	12	6.49	47	3	1.63
28	13	7.03	48	2	1.08
29	10	5.40	49	-	-
30	9	4.86	50	4	2.16
31	9	4.86	51	-	-
32	12	6.49	52	2	1.08
33	7	3.78	53	3	1.63
34	3	1.63	54	1	.54
35	7	3.78	55	2	1.08
36	3	1.63	56	-	-
37	5	2.70	57	1	.54
38	5	2.70	58	3	1.63
39	2	1.08	59	1	.54
40	3	1.63	60	-	-
			Total	185	100.00

Table 23

Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Classified by Activity Scores

Score	Frequency	Percentage
0	7	3.68
1	13	7.10
2	42	22.95
3	45	25.59
4	32	17.49
5	18	9.84
6	14	7.65
7	11	6.01
8	1	.55
9	3	1.64
10	2	1.09
11	2	1.09
Total	183	100.00

Table 24

Percentage Frequency Distribution of Responses to Job Satisfaction Items, Number of Respondents, Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item

Job Satisfaction Item	N	Percentages of Responses* 1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. The average size of class you teach.	188	31.38	53.73	2.66	11.70	.53	1.963	.925
2. Your freedom to select teaching methods	189	63.49	33.86	1.06	1.59	0.00	1.407	.598
3. The prospect of classroom teaching as your lifetime career	188	12.77	34.57	36.17	12.77	3.72	2.601	.987
4. Your freedom to select subject matter for your classes	189	51.86	40.74	3.70	3.70	0.00	1.593	.733
5. The method by which students are assigned to your classes	188	9.57	44.68	15.96	26.60	3.19	2.691	1.062
6. The attitude of students to home economics	188	9.04	54.79	14.89	18.09	3.19	2.516	.992
7. The intellectual stimulation you receive from your work	189	10.05	51.85	18.52	17.46	2.12	2.497	.963
8. The encouragement to develop new and better ways of teaching	189	13.23	47.62	28.57	10.05	.53	2.370	.855
9. The preparation time available to you during the offical school day	189	8.99	39.15	7.94	31.22	12.70	2.995	1.254
10. The number of hours you teach per week	190	17.37	52.63	10.00	15.26	4.74	2.374	1.082
11. The non-teaching duties assigned to you per week	189	13.23	55.55	11.64	13.76	5.82	2.434	1.065
12. The time-tabling of your classes	189	15.87	55.03	11.11	14.82	3.18	2.344	1.015
13. The audiovisual resources available	189	17.46	50.27	10.58	17.99	3.70	2.402	1.082
14. The availability of teacher aides to assist you	180	5.56	19.44	18.33	31.11	25.56	3.517	1.218
15. The physical conditions of your classroom	189	12.70	43.39	6.35	28.04	9.52	2.783	1.247
16. The equipment and equipment maintenance provided	190	12.63	43.69	15.26	24.21	4.21	2.637	1.105
17. The present home economics curriculum	189	6.88	48.15	22.75	17.99	4.23	2.645	.990

Table 24 (continued)

Job Satisfaction Item	N	Percentages of Responses* 1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Standard Deviation
18. The secretarial services available to assist you	187	24.60	49.73	4.81	13.37	7.49	2.294	1.190
19. The availability of substitute teacher services when you wish to be absent for professional activities	186	10.75	43.01	15.05	16.67	14.52	2.812	1.254
20. The performance of substitute teacher services who teacher your classes when absent	185	4.32	42.16	19.46	24.32	9.74	2.930	1.105
21. The methods of handling discipline problems in your school	189	16.40	46.03	13.23	18.52	5.82	2.513	1.139
22. The relationship with other teachers in your school	189	34.92	51.32	6.88	6.88	0.00	1.857	.820
23. The proportion of the school budget available to home economics	190	14.74	56.32	12.10	13.58	3.16	2.342	.991
24. The opportunity for budgetary decision making or control	189	15.87	46.56	13.76	19.58	4.23	2.497	1.101
25. The relationship with students	189	29.10	62.96	5.29	2.12	.53	1.820	.666
26. The opportunity for useful inservice	189	6.88	34.92	25.92	26.46	5.82	2.894	1.054
27. The extent to which your pre-service teacher education prepared you for your teaching position	189	6.35	34.39	21.69	28.57	9.00	2.995	1.115
28. The salary you receive	189	12.17	69.31	5.29	10.58	2.65	2.222	.887
29. Your opportunity for promotion	186	.53	34.95	34.95	22.58	6.99	3.005	.936
30. The opportunity to take university credit courses	187	4.28	30.48	27.27	26.20	11.77	3.107	1.094
31. The opportunity to take further studies at a technical or community college	189	5.82	34.39	28.04	24.87	6.88	2.926	1.046
32. The recognition which the profession gives you for further non-university, or non-credit studies completed	187	2.14	13.37	42.25	30.48	11.76	3.364	.929

Table 24 (continued)

Job Satisfaction Item	N	Percentages of Responses* 1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Standard Deviation
33. The relationship with your department head or principal	188	34.57	54.25	4.26	5.32	1.60	1.851	.850
34. The relationship with central office administrators	190	17.37	48.95	20.53	11.58	1.58	2.310	.942
35. The availability of useful advice to assist you with problems you encounter in teaching	188	11.70	45.21	18.09	20.21	4.79	2.612	1.078
36. The understanding of home economics shown by other teachers in your school	189	3.70	37.57	23.81	30.16	4.76	2.947	1.007
37. The understanding which parents have of home economics	190	1.05	36.32	33.16	26.84	2.63	2.937	.880
38. The understanding which administrators of your school have of home economics	189	12.17	51.32	17.99	15.34	3.18	2.460	.995
39. The availability of assistance to help you with problems specific to the teaching of home economics	188	9.04	38.83	24.47	23.40	4.26	2.750	1.045
40. The opportunity to communicate with other home economics teachers	190	8.42	51.58	14.21	18.95	6.84	2.642	1.090
41. The recognition you receive from your work	189	5.29	46.03	22.22	22.75	3.70	2.735	.989
42. Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with teaching home economics at the present time	189	12.17	69.31	7.41	10.05	1.06	2.185	.812

*
1 means very satisfied
2 means satisfied
3 means cannot decide
4 means dissatisfied
5 means very dissatisifed

Table 25

Correlation Coefficients and Probabilities of Overall Job Satisfaction and Job Satisfaction Variables

		r	p
1.	The average size of class you teach.	.13	.075
2.	Your freedom to select teaching methods.	.36*	<.001
3.	The prospect of classroom teaching as your lifetime career.	.53*	<.001
4.	Your freedom to select subject matter for your classes.	.37*	<.001
5.	The method by which students are assigned to your classes.	.31*	<.001
6.	The attitude of students to home economics.	.34*	<.001
7.	The intellectual stimulation you receive from your work	.55	<.001
8.	The encouragement to develop new and better ways of teaching.	.44*	<.001
9.	The preparation time available to you during the official school day.	.28*	<.001
10.	The number of hours you teach per week.	.32*	<.001
11.	The non-teaching duties assigned to you per week.	.32*	<.001
12.	The time-tabling of your classes.	.14	.051
13.	The audio-visual resources available.	.08	.291
14.	The availability of teacher aides to assist you.	.23*	.002
15.	The physical conditions of your classroom.	.17*	.017
16.	The equipment and equipment maintenance provided.	.17*	.023
17.	The present home economics curriculum.	.14	.055
18.	The secretarial services available to assist you.	.05	.518
19.	The availability of substitute teachers services when you wish to be absent for professional activities	.09	.209

Table 25 (continued)

	r	p
20. The performance of substitute teacher services who teach your classes when absent.	.08	.297
21. The methods of handling discipline problems within your school.	.13	.072
22. The relationship with other teachers in your school.	.18*	.012
23. The proportion of the school budget available to home economics.	.33*	<.001
24. The opportunity for budgetary decision making or control.	.29*	<.001
25. The relationship with students.	.41*	<.001
26. The opportunity for useful inservice education.	.06	.451
27. The extent to which your pre-service teacher education prepared you for your teaching position.	.14	.061
28. The salary you receive.	.15*	.047
29. Your opportunity for promotion.	.28*	.001
30. The opportunity to take university credit courses.	-.02	.826
31. The opportunity to take further studies at a technical or community college.	.08	.253
32. The recognition which the profession gives for further non-university, or non-credit studies completed.	.12	.095
33. The relationship with your department head or principal.	.38*	<.001
34. The relationship with central office administrators.	.38*	<.001
35. The availability of useful advice to assist you with problems you encounter in teaching.	.28*	<.001
36. The understanding of home economics shown by other teachers in your school.	.28*	<.001
37. The understanding which parents have of home economics.	.16*	<.001

Table 25 (continued)

	r	p
38. The understanding which administrators of your school have of home economics.	.28*	.001
39. The availability of assistance to help you with problems specific to the teaching of home economics.	.14	.053
40. The opportunity to communicate with other home economics teachers.	.20*	.005
41. The recognition you receive from your work.	.53*	.005
42. Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with teaching home economics at the present time?		

* $p \leq .05$.

Table 26

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages Satisfied for Different Categories of Experience in Teaching Home Economics

Years of Experience	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
1 - 4 years	77	62	80.52	2.143	.884
5 - 9 years	61	53	86.89	2.131	.741
10 and over	52	40	76.92	2.269	.842

Table 27

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Experience in Teaching Home Economics

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	df	F
Between	.658	.33	2	.48*
Within	128.61	.69	187	
Total	129.268			

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 28

Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Satisfied in Categories of Experience in Teaching Home Economics

Years	Number	Frequency	Percentage
1 - 5	89	72	80.89
6 - 10	60	50	83.33
11 - 15	25	20	80.00
16 - 20	10	6	60.00
21 - 25	4	4	100.00
26 - 30	-	-	-
31 - 35	2	2	100.00

Table 29

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages Satisfied for Those Having and Not Having Teaching Experience in Addition to Home Economics

	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
Teaching experience only in home economics	145	117	81.25	2.19	.858
Teaching experience in addition to home economics	45	37	82.22	2.13	.726

Table 30

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents Having Experience Other than Home Economics and Those Having Only Home Economics Experience

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.096	.10	1	.14*
Within	129.17	.69	188	
Total	129.266			

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 31

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages Satisfied for Different Categories of Years of Training

Years of Training	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
1 - 4 years	131	112	86.15	2.11	.757
5 or 6 years	59	44	74.58	2.32	.955

Table 32

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories of Years of Training

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	1.88	1.88	1	2.78*
Within	127.39	.68	188	
Total	129.27			

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 33

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages Satisfied for Different Categories According to Subject Area Major

Subject Area Major	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
Home economics	181	149	82.32	2.18	.804
Other	8	6	75.00	2.00	1.309

Table 34

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Subject Area Major

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.239	.24	1	.35*
Within	128.34	.69	187	
Total	128.579		188	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 35

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Where University Training Was Obtained

Where University Training Was Obtained	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
Alberta	138	112	81.16	2.17	.859
Other	52	42	80.77	2.19	.742

Table 36

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Where University Training Was Obtained

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.025	.02	1	.04*
Within	129.24	.69	188	
Total	129.27		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 37

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Size of Population Center in Which School is Located

Population Center Size	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 25,000	86	72	83.72	2.15	.805
More than 25,000	104	82	78.85	2.19	.849

Table 38

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Size of Population Center in Which School is Located

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.079	.08	1	.12*
Within	129.12	.69	188	
Total	129.199		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 39

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Age

Age Category	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
21 - 27 years	68	56	82.35	2.10	.849
28 - 35 years	69	53	76.81	2.30	.846
36 - 60 years	48	41	85.42	2.10	.778

Table 40

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Age

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	1.748	.87	2	1.27*
Within	125.368	.69	182	
Total	127.113		184	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 41

Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Satisfied in Categories by Age

Age Category	Number	Frequency Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied
20 - 24 years	33	27	81.82
25 - 29 years	57	43	75.44
30 - 34 years	40	33	82.50
35 - 39 years	22	17	77.27
40 - 44 years	7	5	71.43
45 - 49 years	9	9	100.00
50 - 54 years	10	9	90.00
55 - 60 years	7	4	57.14

Table 42

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Parental Status

Number of Children	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
0	110	89	80.91	2.145	.822
1-7	80	65	81.25	2.212	.837

Table 43

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Parental Status

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.208	.21	1	.30*
Within	129.06	.69	188	
Total	129.268		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 44

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Number of Professional Association Memberships

Number of Memberships	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
0 - 2	93	73	78.49	2.25	.880
3	67	57	85.08	2.09	.712
More than 3	30	24	80.00	2.13	.899

Table 45

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Categories According to Number of Professional Association Memberships

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	1.027	.51	2	.75*
Within	128.242	.69	187	
Total	129.269		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 46

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories of Professional Activity

Activity Score	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
0 - 2	62	53	85.48	2.17	.587
3 - 4	77	63	81.82	2.14	.942
4 or more	51	38	74.51	2.21	.901

Table 47

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores For Respondents in Different Categories of Professional Activity

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.164	.08	2	.12*
Within	129.105	.69	187	
Total	129.269		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 48

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Teaching Level

Teaching Level	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
Junior high only	73	57	78.08	2.14	.822
Senior high only	52	39	75.00	2.29	.977
Combination (junior/senior)	65	58	89.23	2.12	.696

Table 49

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Teaching Level

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	.949	.47	2	.69*
Within	128.319	.69	187	
Total	129.268		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 50

Means, Standard Deviations and Percentages Satisfied for Categories According to Number of Home Economics Subject Areas in Teaching Assignment

Number of Areas	N	Number Satisfied	Percentage Satisfied	Mean	Standard Deviation
One	50	38	76.00	2.36	.898
Two	54	46	85.19	2.09	.701
Three	86	70	81.40	2.11	.851

Table 51

Analysis of Variance of Job Satisfaction Scores for Respondents in Different Categories According to Number of Home Economics Areas in Teaching Assignment

Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F
Between	2.379	1.19	2	1.75*
Within	126.889	.68	187	
Total	129.268		189	

* not significant at $p \leq .05$.

Table 52

Years of Home Economics Teaching Experience of Those Unlikely to be Teaching Home Economics Next Year (N = 24)

Years of Experience	Frequency
1	3
2	1
3	2
4	3
5	4
7	2
8	1
9	1
10	3
11	1
15	2
24	1

Table 53

Years of Training for Respondents Unlikely to be Teaching Next Year (N = 24)

Years	Frequency	Percentage
4	15	62.50
5	8	33.33
6	1	4.17

Table 54

Self-Esteem for Respondents Unlikely to be Teaching Next Year (N = 24)

Score	Frequency	Percentage
0	12	50.00
1	11	45.83
2	-	-
3	-	-
4	-	-
5	1	4.17
6	-	-

Table 55

Correlation Coefficients and Probabilities for Self-Esteem and Job Satisfaction Variables

		r	p
1.	The average size of class you teach.	.171*	.019
2.	Your freedom to select teaching methods.	.067	.360
3.	The prospect of classroom teaching as your lifetime career.	.188*	.010
4.	Your freedom to select subject matter for your classes.	.081	.269
5.	The method by which students are assigned to your classes.	.103	.159
6.	The attitude of students to home economics.	.207*	.004
7.	The intellectual stimulation you receive from your work	.190*	.009
8.	The encouragement to develop new and better ways of teaching.	.119	.102
9.	The preparation time available to you during the official school day.	.137	.060
10.	The number of hours you teach per week.	.119	.101
11.	The non-teaching duties assigned to you per week.	.130	.075
12.	The time-tabling of your classes.	.033	.648
13.	The audio-visual resources available.	.013	.854
14.	The availability of teacher aides to assist you.	.111	.136
15.	The physical conditions of your classroom.	.024	.747
16.	The equipment and equipment maintenance provided.	.021	.771
17.	The present home economics curriculum.	.067	.362
18.	The secretarial services available to assist you.	-.045	.543
19.	The availability of substitute teachers services when you wish to be absent for professional activities	.175*	.017

Table 55 (continued)

		r	p
20.	The performance of substitute teacher services who teach your classes when absent.	.018	.808
21.	The methods of handling discipline problems within your school.	.011	.880
22.	The relationship with other teachers in your school.	-.047	.520
23.	The proportion of the school budget available to home economics.	-.038	.602
24.	The opportunity for budgetary decision making or control.	-.108	.140
25.	The relationship with students.	.202*	.005
26.	The opportunity for useful inservice education.	.030	.687
27.	The extent to which your pre-service teacher education prepared you for your teaching position.	-.010	.894
28.	The salary you receive.	.144*	.049
29.	Your opportunity for promotion.	.138	.060
30.	The opportunity to take university credit courses.	.180*	.014
31.	The opportunity to take further studies at a technical or community college.	.273*	<.001
32.	The recognition which the profession gives for further non-university, or non-credit studies completed.	.236*	<.001
33.	The relationship with your department head or principal.	.056	.448
34.	The relationship with central office administrators.	.015	.843
35.	The availability of useful advice to assist you with problems you encounter in teaching.	.073	.323
36.	The understanding of home economics shown by other teachers in your school.	.015	.839
37.	The understanding which parents have of home economics.	.084	.251

Table 55 (continued)

		r	p
38.	The understanding which administrators of your school have of home economics.	.035	.630
39.	The availability of assistance to help you with problems specific to the teaching of home economics.	.097	.183
40.	The opportunity to communicate with other home economics teachers.	.125	.086
41.	The recognition you receive from your work.	.130	.074
42.	Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with teaching home economics at the present time?	.227*	.002

* $p \leq .05$.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY FORM

SURVEY FORM

Section I: Job satisfaction

In this section, you are asked to indicate how you feel about your present work situation as a home economics teacher - your satisfactions and dissatisfactions. For each statement, there are five possible responses:

VS - means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my work situation.
S - means I am satisfied with this aspect of my work situation.
N - means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or dissatisfied with this aspect of my work situation.
DS - means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my work situation.
VDS - means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my work situation.

Please check the response which best indicates your attitude to each statement.

This column is for computer use only.

CC
Subject: ___ 1-3
Card #: ___ 4

	1 VS	2 S	3 N	4 DS	5 VDS	
1. The average size of class you teach.						___ 6
2. Your freedom to select teaching methods.						___ 7
3. The prospect of classroom teaching as your lifetime career.						___ 8
4. Your freedom to select subject matter for your classes.						___ 9
5. The method by which students are assigned to your classes.						___ 10
6. The attitude of students to home economics.						___ 11
7. The intellectual stimulation you receive from your work.						___ 12
8. The encouragement to develop new and better ways of teaching.						___ 13
9. The preparation time available to you during the official school day.						___ 14
10. The number of hours you teach per week.						___ 15
11. The non-teaching duties assigned to you per week.						___ 16
12. The time-tabling of your classes.						___ 17
13. The audio-visual resources available.						___ 18
14. The availability of teacher aides to assist you.						___ 19
15. The physical conditions of your classroom.						___ 20
16. The equipment and equipment maintenance provided.						___ 21
17. The present home economics curriculum.						___ 22
18. The secretarial services available to assist you.						___ 23
19. The availability of substitute teachers services when you wish to be absent for professional activities.						___ 24
20. The performance of substitute teacher services who teach your classes when absent.						___ 25
21. The methods of handling discipline problems within your school.						___ 26
22. The relationship with other teachers in your school.						___ 27

CC

	1 VS	2 S	3 N	4 DS	5 VDS	
23. The proportion of the school budget available to home economics.						___ 28
24. The opportunity for budgetary decision making or control.						___ 29
25. The relationship with students.						___ 30
26. The opportunity for useful inservice education.						___ 31
27. The extent to which your pre-service teacher education prepared you for your teaching position.						___ 32
28. The salary you receive.						___ 33
29. Your opportunity for promotion.						___ 34
30. The opportunity to take university credit courses.						___ 35
31. The opportunity to take further studies at a technical or community college.						___ 36
32. The recognition which the profession gives for further non-university, or non-credit studies completed.						___ 37
33. The relationship with your department head or principal.						___ 38
34. The relationship with central office administrators.						___ 39
35. The availability of useful advice to assist you with problems you encounter in teaching.						___ 40
36. The understanding of home economics shown by other teachers in your school.						___ 41
37. The understanding which parents have of home economics.						___ 42
38. The understanding which administrators of your school have of home economics.						___ 43
39. The availability of assistance to help you with problems specific to the teaching of home economics.						___ 44
40. The opportunity to communicate with other home economics teachers.						___ 45
41. The recognition you receive from your work.						___ 46
42. Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with teaching home economics at the present time?						___ 47

43. What changes would you like to see in the next <u>five years</u> which you believe would do the most to improve your satisfaction with teaching home economics:

(a) in your present situation?

(b) in general (in Alberta)?

Section II. Self rating Scale

In this section, you are asked to indicate how you feel about yourself, by responding to each statement with one of the four possible responses:

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

Please check the response which best indicates your attitude to each statement. CC

	1 SA	2 A	3 D	4 SD	
1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.					___ 48
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.					___ 49
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.					___ 50
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.					___ 51
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.					___ 52
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.					___ 53
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.					___ 54
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.					___ 55
9. I certainly feel useless at times.					___ 56
10. At times, I think I am no good at all.					___ 57

Reprinted from Society and the Adolescent Self-Image, by Morris Rosenberg (Princeton University Press, 1965; Princeton Paperback, 1968): Self-Esteem Scales. Used by permission of Princeton University Press.

Section III - Demographic data

For the purposes of meaningful interpretation of the survey, you are asked to provide some information about yourself and your job situation.

1. Counting the present year as a full year, how many years of experience do you have as a home economics teacher? _____ ___ 58-59

2. How many years of teaching experience do you have in total? _____ ___ 60-61

3. Please check the number of years of academic training beyond high school, for which you are evaluated for salary purposes.

1 ( ) 3 ( ) 5 ( )
2 ( ) 4 ( ) 6 ( ) ___ 62

4. What was your subject area major at university?

Home economics ( )
Other ( ) ___ 63

5. Where have you obtained most of your university education?

Alberta ( ) Other Canadian province ( )
United States ( ) Other country ( ) ___ 64

CC

6. What is the size of the population center in which your school is located?

less than 10,000	( )	
10,000 - 25,000	( )	
over 25,000	( )	___ 65

7. What is your age? _____ ___ 66

8. How many children do you have? _____ ___ 67

9. In how many professional associations do you hold membership? _____ ___ 68

10. In how many of the following professional related activities have you participated in the past two years?

	1-2	3-4	5 or more	
conferences	( )	( )	( )	___ 71
workshops or seminars	( )	( )	( )	___ 72
non-credit courses	( )	( )	( )	___ 73
university credit courses	( )	( )	( )	___ 74
programs offering certification	( )	( )	( )	___ 75

11. Please indicate the percentage of your time and the level at which you are presently teaching home economics within the school system. Card #:

elementary (1-6)	( )% of time	___ 5-7
junior high (7-9)	( )% of time	___ 8-10
senior high (10-12)	( )% of time	___ 11-13

12. Please check the home economics subject area(s) that you are teaching this year.

Modern Living	( )	___ 14
Clothing & Textiles	( )	___ 15
Food Science	( )	___ 16

13. How likely is it that you will continue working as a home economics teacher next year?

Not at all likely	( )	
Unlikely	( )	
Uncertain	( )	___ 17
Likely	( )	
Extremely likely	( )	

If unlikely, what do you expect to be doing next year?

_____ ___ 18

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE

First Letter Mailed to all Subjects

April 23, 1979

Dear

As part of my Master's program at the University of Alberta, I am conducting a study of the job satisfaction of home economics teachers. The findings of this study should be of interest to teachers, administrators, and consultants, by providing information relevant to professional development, curriculum, and the work situation of home economics teachers. Will you participate in this study by completing the enclosed survey form?

Approximately twenty minutes of your time will be required to complete the survey form. In completing the job satisfaction section, please respond according to how you view your situation as a home economics teacher. The self-rating section requires that you respond according to your views of yourself as an individual. The number code appearing on the survey form will be used to identify your response and will not be associated with your name after the return of your reply is noted. This coding allows your response to be anonymous and also lets me know which forms are yet to be returned.

Please use the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to return the completed survey form at your earliest convenience. I hope that the findings of this study can be made available to you in a future professional publication. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Yours truly
Linda Peterat
Linda Peterat
Graduate student

Verna Lefebvre
Verna Lefebvre
Associate Professor

First Follow Up Letter Contained in Second Mailing

May 7, 1979

Dear

Approximately two weeks ago, I mailed to you a survey form as part of a study on the job satisfaction of home economics teachers. It is important to the study that as many participants as possible complete and return the forms. Your taking the time to respond to the survey will be very much appreciated. For your convenience, I have enclosed another copy of the survey form and a self addressed stamped envelope.

The survey form takes approximately twenty minutes to complete. The number code which appears on the survey form is used to note the return of your reply. All replies will be treated anonymously.

Thank you for your anticipated assistance. If you have completed the survey form and have already mailed it, thank you for your help.

Yours truly

Linda Peterat

Linda Peterat
Graduate student

Verna Lefebvre

Verna Lefebvre
Associate Professor

Second Follow Up Letter Contained in Third Mailing

May 24, 1979

Dear

Several weeks ago I mailed to you a reminder letter and survey form as part of a study on the job satisfaction of home economics teachers. It is important to the study that as many participants as possible complete and return the survey forms. I am therefore sending you a final reminder and copy of the survey form.

The survey form takes approximately twenty minutes to complete. The number code which appears on the survey form is used to note the return of your reply. All replies will be treated anonymously.

If you have completed the survey form and already mailed it, thank you for your help. If you have yet to return the form, your doing so by June 11, 1979, will be most appreciated.

Yours truly

Linda Peterat

Linda Peterat
Graduate student

Verna Lefebvre

Verna Lefebvre
Associate Professor

VITA

NAME: Linda B. Peterat

PLACE OF BIRTH: Portage la Prairie, Manitoba

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1946

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND DEGREES:

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1964 - 67, B.Sc. H.E.

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1970 - 71, B.Ed.

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1978 - 79, M.Ed.

RELATED WORK EXPERIENCE:

Teacher
Portage la Prairie School Division
Portage la Prairie, Manitoba
1968 - 70

Teacher
County of Parkland
Stony Plain, Alberta
1972 - 1977

Graduate Assistant
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
1978 - 79